

THE

# SOLICITORS' JOURNAL.

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—*Town*, 26s.; *Country*, 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTS, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s.

All letters intended for publication in the Solicitors' Journal must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Country, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

\* A press of matter compels us to leave over several communications and reports.

## The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, NOVEMBER 7, 1874.

### CURRENT TOPICS.

IT IS TO BE HOPED, but hardly to be expected, that the medical journals will forbear to avail themselves of the vacancy occasioned by the death of Dr. Lankester to raise the cry of medical coroners. We shall probably be assured that no one but a doctor ought to hold this office because no one but a medical man can "appreciate" medical evidence. The matter is one which ought not to be lowered to the level of a scramble for appointments between the members of two professions. It is absurd to contend, in the face of every-day experience, that no one but a doctor can properly fulfil the duties of coroner; but on the other hand, we do not maintain that a lawyer-candidate is always the fittest person for the office. The public interest demands that the best man who offers shall be elected, whatever may be his profession, and we readily allow that a shrewd and sensible medical man may make a better coroner than a foolish and inexperienced lawyer. But we must point out once more, as we have often done before, that, *ceteris paribus*, the lawyer is better fitted for the office than the doctor. Even taking the case as it is sometimes put on the medical side, and admitting for the moment that the object of the coroner's inquest is merely to discover the cause of death, and that the evidence given is mainly medical, it may be asked whether there is any necessity that such evidence should be so wrapped up in professional jargon as to be unintelligible to all but the initiated; or whether it is right that the testimony on which the jury found their verdict should be not that given by the medical witnesses, but their evidence as interpreted by the coroner? If judges and juries when trying criminal cases manage to understand the evidence of doctors, there does not seem to be any reason why an intelligent lawyer-coroner should find any difficulty with it. If special scientific knowledge is not neces-

sary to understand the medical evidence, we fail to see in what respect a doctor is better fitted for the office of coroner than an experienced lawyer.

So long, however, as the coroner's inquisition, finding anyone guilty of murder, operates as an indictment, the inquiry cannot be said to be directed merely to ascertain the cause of death, nor is the evidence confined to medical evidence. The inquiry is into the guilt or innocence of the persons implicated, and is on the same footing with other enquiries before preliminary criminal courts. Which quality then is the more useful in the magistrate who conducts these enquiries, knowledge of physiology or knowledge of the rules of evidence; experience in dissecting "subjects" or in analysing testimony; skill in diagnosing disease or in extracting the truth from unwilling witnesses? Which can be the more readily dispensed with in the coroner—knowledge which it is the duty of medical witnesses to supply to the jury, or knowledge which, if not possessed by the coroner, no one else can furnish to them? There can be but one answer to this. Then, who is the more likely to possess this essential knowledge of the rules of evidence and skill in the practical conduct of an inquiry—the lawyer, whose business it is to deal with evidence, whether civil or criminal, or the doctor, whose business it is to study the structure and diseases of the human body? Perhaps, before raising their accustomed cry, our medical contemporaries will ponder over these questions.

MUCH CURIOSITY HAS BEEN EXPRESSED during the past week among those who have visited the old Hall of Lincoln's Inn upon the question to whom the credit is due of devising the arrangements by which a noble room has been converted into such an inconvenient court. A suggestion has been hazarded that some benches of the Inn to which the building belongs has been trying his hand at designing the internal fittings, and having before his mind his past sufferings in the way of interruptions from the judges, has taken every precaution that no remarks from the bench shall be audible at the bar. Certain it is that if this had been the object in view it could hardly have been more effectually attained. The judges sit in the middle of a semicircular dais altogether outside of the canopy which has overshadowed so many Lord Chancellors. Between them and the wall behind, there is room enough for a crowd of visitors, perhaps reserved in anticipation of some future case of the character of Dr. Hayman's, necessitating accommodation on the bench for dignitaries of Church and State. At present the sole occupant of this vacant space is an attendant, who sits apart, like a pelican in the wilderness. Inside the semicircle, at a table of an economical type, sits the Registrar, flanked and protected by those important officers, "Mace" and "Pursebearer." The solicitors' well is apparently con-

structed on the theory that after the Judicature Act comes into operation not only will pleadings be abridged, but the legs of solicitors will be shortened. The width of the seat and of the space in front, as well as the general arrangements of the "well," have evidently been carefully modelled on the type furnished by the free seats for paupers at the back of the galleries in old parish churches. Impressed with the advantages of walking exercise for judges who have to sit so much, the designer has by a happy thought, placed their retiring rooms at the opposite end of the hall to that at which they sit, and has constructed a species of rabbit-run for these exalted personages, boxed off from the rest of the court, so that if, in the passage from the room to the bench, it should be found that a handkerchief or glasses have been left behind, the learned owner can rush back unobserved, and overtake his brethren before they have finished their journey. Bench, bar, and solicitors are alike most successfully rendered miserable; and as for the general public, they are punished for their curiosity in venturing to be present at the administration of justice, by being left seatless, to witness what must often be to them a mere dumb show.

WHAT CAN BE MORE AGREEABLE to human vanity and love of power than to be able to send a man to prison, especially without trial? To have no one to stand between you and the criminal, except the executioner; to be judge, jury, and witnesses all in one; to vindicate the majesty of justice enshrined in the honoured person of *oneself*; to exercise a jurisdiction that is confined by no crabbed rules of law, but may embrace all forms and degrees of crime, from the forgery of a public document to dazzling the eyes of the court by putting the gas too high—this is to possess a solid source of self-content. We are not, therefore, surprised that the visiting justices of the Kirkdale Quarter Sessions are anxious to become sharers in this dignifying power. They say they want to be able "to preserve order in their courts," to have "some clear authority to deal with people who act in an insolent and insubordinate manner;" and therefore they think that the Home Secretary should be recommended to "make such an alteration in the law as would enable magistrates sitting in petty sessions to preserve order in their courts;" that is, as we gather from the observations of one of the speakers at the quarter sessions, to enable them to commit for seven days for contempt of court, or to fine the offender. We should like to hear the particulars of the occasion on which the want of this power has produced such ill effects, and who were the persons against whom it ought to have been directed. Were the "insolent and insubordinate" offenders, spectators? Why, no one doubts that magistrates may put a noisy and uproarious man out of the justice-room; and in common sense what more is needed? Or is the criminal law not strong enough for the prisoner before them? Or do not the police obey their orders? Or is it, perhaps, the advocates who need to be brought to a more deferential submission? The more the matter is reduced to detail, and the question plainly asked—what necessity is there for conferring this power? the more clearly evident it becomes that there is none, and that the only purposes for which it is likely to be used are mischievous. It is to be hoped that no Government will be so ill-advised as to seek to add to the class of those who have been led by the possession of this arbitrary and irresponsible power to play such fantastic freaks as we have sometimes witnessed, or that at least no Parliament will be weak enough to yield to the request.

WE ARE SORRY TO OBSERVE that in his introductory sessional lecture at University College, a report of which we print elsewhere, Professor Amos lends his sanction to what we cannot but regard as a very injurious error

He draws a sharp distinction between the art and the science of law, and he teaches his hearers to regard their work in making acquaintance with English law, in studying the principles of the interpretation of statutes and in deducing rules from judicial decisions, as the study of an art, while in studying civil law or international law he tells them they will be studying a science. This is a position we can in no degree assent to. The only intelligible distinction between a science and an art is, that the one consists of reasoned rules, the other either of no rules but only of practical tact, or of rules which stand in no relation of dependence to one another. In the degree in which any subject admits of and possesses a coherent body of rules, in that degree it becomes a science. Whether the rules are bad or good, reasonable or unreasonable, is immaterial in this view, provided only they are logical and coherent. It is true that if rules are bad and unreasonable the system which contains them is not likely to be logical and coherent, because there will be a continual tendency to restrict and narrow their operation, and to reduce them to an exceptional position, and thus there will be a want of that *elegantia* which belongs to a logical system. But the fact that a system contains many particular and special rules in no way interferes with its scientific character. Every system of law necessarily contains such, the civil law not less than the English. And not only does every system of law in fact contain such rules, but no system could exist without them. It is a fond imagination to suppose that from some general notions as to what is a contract, or what is property, any system of definite rules of law could be deduced, because the question in law is not what states of fact independent of law are possible, but what facts and what relations it is expedient that the law should take notice of and maintain, and by what means this should be done. These rules do not interfere with the scientific character of the system in which they exist, but they are that without which the system could not exist at all. They are laid down for some end of justice or convenience. They are dealt with intelligently and scientifically if they are acted upon and interpreted according to that end, that is if the purpose and reason of the rule is understood and followed. To say that the study of any particular system of law is the study of an art and not of a science, is to say that the rules which compose it are so destitute of purpose and reason, and so particular and isolated that they cannot be reasoned upon, but can only be applied like a measuring-tape to any particular circumstances that may arise.

To say that English law is of this order is not, we imagine, what Professor Amos means; for to say this would be an absurdity—as absurd as it would be to say that there was a scientific quality about the distinction of *res mancipi* and *nec mancipi*, or about the amount of a *portio legitima*, or the mode of making a will *per æs et libram*. The scientific character of the study of law does not depend on its being applied to this or that system, but on the reasoning method which is applied to the study. It is a matter for reasonable doubt whether English law has gained in scientific character by many changes which have been conducive to general convenience, but which have in some directions broken down a coherent system. But it is certain that nothing could be more injurious than to pursue the study of our law otherwise than in a logical and scientific spirit; and that a student could not be more misled than by being told that he was to look upon it merely as an art consisting of maxims to be got by rote. Professor Amos does not indeed tell the student to do so; but—though he seems not to see his inconsistency—he tells him that in learning principles of interpretation, and in deducing principles from decisions, he is in fact doing so; when he should, on the contrary, tell him that in doing these things he is in fact, if he does them rightly, learning how to think and reason scientifically. We do not say a word to deny that the student who studies civil law or foreign systems in a true scientific spirit will find the pursuit conduce to

his scientific training; but we are certain that one who does not deal with his own law in that spirit will acquire no science from any other, or from the vague something which is known as general jurisprudence, but will only put together a jumble of rules as arbitrary to him as he conceives those of his own law to be, and which will derive their chief value in his eyes from the fact that he supposes his knowledge to be peculiar.

A QUESTION NATURALLY SUGGESTED by the impending contest for the post of successor to Dr. Lankester is whether it is desirable that the office of coroner should continue to be elective. Without saying that "mean persons and indiscreet" (*petits gens et méins sages*, see 3 Ed., 1 c. 10) find their way to the place, it must be confessed that the turmoil of a popular election affords a heavy discouragement to the candidature "of the most wise and discreet knights" (*des pl. leal et plus sages Chivaliers*), which the still unrepealed statute of Westminster enacts that coroners should be. Many well qualified men cannot afford the cost of contesting a county election. It is to be borne in mind that it is only in counties that the office depends upon a genuine popular election; the electors being the "freeholders" possessed of a freehold estate in the county, however small, provided that it have not been granted to the elector "fraudulently or colourably on purpose to qualify him to give his vote" (see 7 & 8 Vict c. 92, s. 13). In boroughs having a separate court of Quarter Sessions, the coroner is appointed by the town council, the only qualification being that he must be "a fit person." We must say that, looking to the responsible functions which the coroner exercises, we think he ought to be appointed by the Crown, or if that be thought too centralising a proposal, he ought in counties to be nominated by the justices in Quarter Sessions, as borough coroners are by the town council.

#### ADVANCED FREIGHT.

By a majority of three against two, which, for the reasons we shall shortly give, we can hardly reckon as more than an equal division of opinion, the Court of Exchequer Chamber has, in *Allison v. Bristol Marine Insurance Company* (22 W. R. 920, L. R. 9 C. P. 559), reversed the decision of the three learned judges of the court below (21 W. R. 735). The case, having regard to the ground on which it is now decided, is of very great importance, and it is remarkable for the circumstance that opinions are so divided on what must be, and must for many years have been, a matter of almost daily practice.

The action was brought on a policy on freight, and two questions arose. The first was as to the construction of the policy, either with or without certain evidence, the admissibility of which to construe the policy was a point in dispute. This first question was the only one about which the court below (Bovill, C.J., and Brett and Grove, JJ.) entertained any doubt; in the result they came to the conclusion that the policy covered the freight which was at risk. But this question has disappeared from the arguments and the judgments above, and the second question, on which the court below had no hesitation, is the only one which seems to have been discussed on the appeal, and is the one on which the judgment turns. That question was, what freight was at risk? and it arose thus:—

The plaintiff had chartered his ship to one De Mattos for a cargo of coals, "freight to be paid on unloading and right delivery of cargo at and after the rate of 42s. per ton of 20 cwt. on the quantity delivered . . . and such freight is to be paid, say one half in cash, on signing bills of lading, less four months' interest at Bank rate, but not less than 5 per cent. per annum, 5 per cent. for insurance, and 2½ per cent. on gross amount of freight in lieu of consignment

at Bombay, and the remainder on right delivery of the cargo." The cargo was shipped and the half freight paid; but half the cargo was lost at sea, and half therefore only remained for delivery at Bombay. It was there assumed by both parties that, half the freight having been already paid, and only half the cargo having been delivered, no freight was payable at Bombay; the residue of the cargo was therefore delivered free, and the shipowner claimed under the policy as for a total loss of the half freight which he had failed to realise. The defendant contended that the view on which the parties had acted at Bombay was erroneous; that the advanced freight paid in England was to be distributed or apportioned, so as to attribute £1 1s. to each ton, and to leave each ton actually delivered liable to pay the remaining £1 1s., and that the plaintiff had thus not lost half his freight, but only the half of a half, that is, £1 1s. a ton on the amount of the cargo that was lost. Upon this point the Court of Common Pleas held, without hesitation, that no such distribution was to be made. The court above, by three against two, have held that it ought to be made, and have reversed the judgment.

"There is," as Cleasby, B., says, "nothing unusual in the terms of this charter-party," nor do the judgments of the majority proceed upon the view that there was; we must, therefore, treat the decision as resting on general grounds, and as applicable to all ordinary cases of advanced freight; and it is this that makes it of so much importance. It is in effect a decision that on a single shipment at a single rate of freight, freight paid in advance is to be taken as paid distributively in respect of each portion of the cargo, and that the shipowner is entitled to be paid the residue of the freight on any portion delivered. This is very clearly expressed by Cockburn, C.J., as follows:—"I cannot but suppose that on a charter-party of this description a payment of freight in advance, which by the English law in case of the loss of the cargo cannot be recovered back, presupposes in the contemplation of the parties a delivery of the entire cargo, and is paid in respect of the entire cargo, and is therefore distributable over the entire cargo; for which reason it is not, as it appears to me, competent to the owner of the cargo to appropriate the whole of the amount prepaid to that portion of the cargo which is actually delivered, and he can only have the benefit of such prepayment *pro rata* on the cargo delivered." Mellor, J., though not expressing it in equally clear and forcible terms, concurs in this view.

On the other hand, Cleasby, B. (in whose judgment Pollock, B., concurs) says, "I do not think we can depart from the settled meaning of the word freight, and the meaning expressly given to it in this charter-party—viz., the amount to be paid at the end of the voyage for what is ready for delivery at the stipulated rate. This had been wholly satisfied by the advance made, and so the shipowner was entitled to receive no more, and the captain was right in delivering the half cargo free of freight."

Now upon this we must observe that it is impossible to state so strongly as is done by Cleasby, B., "the settled meaning of the word freight," or "the meaning expressly given to it in the charter-party," because, although freight doubtless means ordinarily "the amount to be paid at the end of the voyage," yet the sum paid before-hand on account of the carriage or intended carriage of the goods is universally spoken of as "advanced freight," and by this very charter-party half the "freight" was to be paid on signing bills of lading. The "freight" so paid was certainly not any "amount to be paid at the end of the voyage," nor was it strictly a sum paid on account of what might become payable at the end of the voyage; but it was a sum paid at once for good and all, and remained so paid and not recoverable back, although there had been at the end of the voyage no freight earned at all in the strict sense to which it could be applied, or on account of which it could be deemed to have been paid. The argument



proves too much, for if it proves anything it proves that what was paid in advance might, in the event of a total loss, have been recovered back, which all parties admitted to be otherwise. But if it is said that that which is called freight is freight, or at least is something paid on account of what will hereafter be freight, and it is merely by virtue of custom and usage, established as law, that it cannot be recovered back, although there is never any true freight, and although it is not in fact credited to that account in respect of which it is said to be paid, then the argument (which is, to be sure, rather a play upon words than a substantial argument of any kind) proves nothing. For if all is to be retained, where nothing is delivered, it is at least equally possible that the payment in respect of any particular portion should be retained, though that portion is not delivered; and the question still remains, what was the sum which, on making the prepayment, had been paid in respect of that portion of cargo which was in fact ready for delivery on the arrival of the vessel? The one side said "One guinea only had been paid in respect of each ton which was ready for delivery, although one guinea had also been paid in respect of each ton that went to the bottom of the sea; let it be granted that the word 'freight' is throughout properly and strictly used, still 'freight' means freight for each ton, and not freight for the whole cargo." The other side said "No; 'freight' means freight for the whole cargo." But which of the two was right cannot be in any way shown from the argument put forward in the sentences quoted from Baron Cleasby's judgment.

But, on the other hand, the argument of Cockburn, C.J., also proves too much. If the transaction itself "presupposes in the contemplation of the parties the delivery of the entire cargo," then it follows that the payment is made on the basis of the delivery of the entire cargo, and conditionally on this delivery taking place, and that if the cargo is not delivered it can be recovered back, which is clearly otherwise. Nor, as a matter of fact, is it possible that the parties can have actually presupposed, or had in contemplation as the basis of the transaction that which is contrary to the settled law and mercantile practice of 200 years. And if the law and the facts contradict, to the advantage of the shipowner and the disadvantage of the merchant, the notion of any such presupposition or contemplation in the parties, when the question is whether, on a total loss, the money paid can be recovered back, why should such a presupposition or contemplation be inferred to the further advantage of the former and disadvantage of the latter, when the question is whether, on a partial loss, the latter is to have the whole benefit or only a partial benefit of his payment? The logic of the matter seems quite the other way; if there is no such presupposition for one purpose, there ought to be no such presupposition for the other.

If, instead of prepayment of an aliquot portion of the freight, a lump sum had been stipulated for, we very much doubt whether the same decision would have been arrived at. But a certain speciousness is given to the view taken by the majority of the court by the circumstance that an aliquot portion of the freight is mentioned, which, as it were, naturally distributes itself over those rateable portions of the cargo by reference to which the freight is fixed, and so over the portions of freight which may be separately attributed to them. And if it is true that a different conclusion would have been arrived at if a lump sum had been prepaid, this must be really the ground of the decision. And we believe that it is in fact the ground of the decision, although it is not put forward as such. But it must be remembered that the construction arrived at is one wholly to the advantage of the shipowner, who must be regarded as the author of this stipulation for his own interest; and if the mention of an aliquot part can be sufficiently accounted for (as it reasonably may) by its forming a convenient method of arriving at the sum to

be paid, it is doubtful whether it should be made the ground of any other inference in his favour. Moreover, by the charter-party, the charterer is to load a cargo, and to pay freight for the cargo, and he is to prepay half "such freight," that is, the freight of the cargo. If it is a rateable freight, it is an entire contract; and the singleness of the contract is at least as strong an argument for treating the prepayment as made against the whole freight to be gained, as the rateable mode of calculating the prepayment is for making it distributable over the separate parts of the cargo. Indeed, there is ground for saying that the former is a substantial reason, and that the latter is not a reason, but only the specious appearance of a reason, arising out of the opportunity furnished by the possibility of an apportionment.

Under these circumstances it is impossible not to attach great weight to what may be the recognised usage in such matters. If the question is, what is likely to be presupposed by or in the contemplation of the parties, although evidence of the practice under similar instruments may not be admissible, it is one of those cases in which judges are entitled to apply their own experience and knowledge of mercantile usage. It is very emphatically stated by Cleasby, B. (in whose judgment Pollock, B., concurs), that the practice is, and has universally been, as it was in this case according to the view which he supports, and from the way in which the question was treated by the judges in the court below, we may infer that they also looked upon it as a matter of course. Bovill, C.J., and Brett, J., and Cleasby and Pollock, BB., are certainly judges to whom a very large experience in mercantile practice may be attributed, and the statements of Cleasby, B., are not controverted by any of the learned judges of the majority. If this is so, it would lead us to suppose that something very different was in the contemplation of the parties from that which is attributed to them by the judgment of the Exchequer Chamber.

We have not referred to the judgment of Amphlett, B., because, while he adhered to the view taken by the majority of the court (though he expresses that view in language which is strictly applicable to the view of the minority), he appears to have done so for a reason which can command no assent. That reason was as follows:—The charterer had insured his cargo in a valued policy for a sum which covered the value as enhanced by the prepaid freight (as he might have insured it in a valued policy to any amount he pleased), and it was argued that the judgment must be wrong, because he could, in the events which had happened, get back from his underwriters one half of his advance, and yet have the benefit of his whole advance in having the remaining part of the cargo delivered free of freight. This argument was adopted by the learned Baron, who characterized the result as "so strange and inequitable" as to render it impossible not to suspect the judgment of error; and he further added that if the charterer had separately insured the prepaid moiety, the result would have been "equally strange and inequitable," because his underwriters would have borne no loss, while the shipowner's underwriters would have borne the whole. Why it would be "inequitable," in the hypothetical case put, that one man should bear the loss of a risk which he has taken on himself, and that another man should not bear any loss from a risk which he has taken on himself, but from which no loss has resulted, it is hard to see; and the want of "equity" can, we imagine, only be established by the proposition that when two men are interested in a common event their interests are necessarily the same and any loss ought to be divided equally between them, on the principle that "equality is equity." Unless it is "inequitable" that men should abide by their contracts, it cannot be wrong to ascertain whether a man ought to pay for a loss by inquiring merely whether the loss which he has insured against has happened, nor right to fix a liability upon another, because he will otherwise

have had a successful transaction while his neighbour has been unfortunate. And with respect to the actual case, the apparent unfairness of which resulted simply (as Cleasby, B., points out) from the incidents of a valued policy, and indeed with respect to the whole of the argument drawn from these considerations, we must ask how it can possibly be right to determine the rights of the parties to a contract by considering what has been or may be the gain or loss resulting from totally independent contracts, made by each of them separately with third persons who are no parties to the litigation, and whose rights and liabilities are not even presented for legal investigation? "The question must," as Cockburn, C.J., said, be considered irrespectively of the insurances which the shipowner or the charterer may have effected for the protection of actual or supposed interests; in other words, according to the terms of the charter-party, and the rights and liabilities of the parties as thereby created;" and Mellor, J., equally avoids the snare spread for him by the ingenious counsel for the defendants.

The point at present cannot be considered as satisfactorily settled, the opinion of five judges being, as the matter stands, overruled by three, and the judgment of one of the three being based on grounds which so greatly diminish, if they do not destroy, the authority of his opinion.

#### RECENT DECISIONS AFFECTING SOLICITORS.

##### I.

We propose in this and two or three following articles to gather together and present in a concise form all the reported cases affecting solicitors which have been decided in England or in the superior courts in Ireland during the past legal year, and also all the cases of the same kind which were decided before, but reported during that period. We should premise that the ordinary decisions on the subject of costs do not rank among the cases which we are about to summarise. Those decisions no doubt indirectly affect solicitors, but their direct effect is on the litigating parties. The cases to which we intend to call attention are those which directly affect solicitors as such. We shall begin with the cases affecting incipient solicitors, that is to say, articulated clerks.

The object of 6 & 7 Vict. c. 73, s. 12, which requires that every articulated clerk shall, during the whole term of his articles, continue and be actually employed in the proper business, practice, or employment of an attorney or solicitor, is "that he may acquire not only legal knowledge but practical experience" (Per Blackburn, J., in *Ex parte H. W. Moses*, 22 W. R. 57, L. R. 9 Q. B. 1). In that case, during the fourth year of the articles, an absence, with the leave of the employer, of eleven calendar months, during eight of which the clerk, also with his employer's leave, took a voyage to Australia for the benefit of his health, was held too long a breach in his service. "A reasonable amount of absence for holidays," said Blackburn, J., "or short intervals of absence owing to sickness, would not prevent the service counting. But when, as in the present case, the clerk is absent on a long voyage to the Antipodes, he can have been acquiring no experience at all."

In the subsequent case of *Ex parte G. Marshall* (22 W. R. 754) the same court held a much shorter absence to be too great a break in the service. In that case, during the fifth year of the articles, an absence, permitted by the employer, on account of ill-health, on a sea voyage which lasted five months and seventeen days, having been held by the Law Society to be a reason for declining a certificate of having passed the final examination, and for requiring the clerk to enter into fresh articles for five months, the court refused to interfere with the decision of the society, either by relieving the clerk altogether,

or by making a prospective order for admittance after serving the five months without entering into fresh articles.

An articulated clerk in Ireland, whose articles would have expired by effluxion of time on the 16th November, but whose employer died in September, passed his final examination with great credit; and on his application the Court of Exchequer, Ireland, dispensed with the usual indenture of assignment, and also the necessary affidavit by an employer at the end of the clerk's service (*In re P. J. Gallagher*, 18 S. J. 66).

The case of *Ex parte H. W. Trenchard* (18 S. J. 508, L. R. 9 Q. B. 406) was a case under the 13th section of 6 & 7 Vict. c. 73, which, among other things, provides that if articles of clerkship "shall by mutual consent of the parties be cancelled," the clerk may be bound by other articles during the residue of his term, and service under the fresh articles shall be good and effectual. In the case in question it was desired to show that articles were cancelled by mutual consent; but there was apparently nothing to show this except the fact that the clerk, being articulated to his father, became of delicate health, and was advised by his doctors to seek more active occupation, and that, under these circumstances, his father obtained him a commission in the army, about two years and eight months after the commencement of the articles. The clerk remained in the army for about eleven years, and then sold out and entered into fresh articles with his father. The Court of Queen's Bench (Blackburn, J., *dubitante*) held that from the facts of the case it should be inferred that the former articles were cancelled with the mutual consent of the parties; and that accordingly service under them ought to be allowed to count. The grounds of this decision were, that as it is only by permission that an officer can sell out, and as in time of war he cannot sell out at all, the father must have known that he was allowing his son to enter into a service from which he could not be recalled at any moment. In expressing his doubts, Blackburn, J., said, "I cannot help thinking that if the case had been reversed, and the son had claimed to serve the remaining portion of his articles because they had never been cancelled, we should have had some difficulty in saying that he had not a right to do so." (18 S. J. 508).

In *Ex parte Hayward* (39 L. T. 422), an articulated clerk "being," as Blackburn, J., said in the case, "most excusably misled by the Stamp Act," took his articles to be stamped within six months of their execution, when he was informed that he must pay a penalty of £10. On this, he memorialised the Inland Revenue, but his memorial was rejected. He subsequently paid the duty and penalty, and now, about two years and three months after the execution of the articles, he applied that his service might reckon from their execution instead of from the day of filing the affidavit required with their enrolment. His application was granted, Blackburn, J., expressing his opinion that the Legislature, when passing the Act of 1870, section 43, which provides that "articles of clerkship are not to be stamped at any time after the expiration of six months from the date thereof, except upon payment of penalties, as follows:—(1) If brought to be stamped within one year after date £10, &c.," could not have been aware of the existence of 34 Geo. 3 c. 14, s. 10, which provides that "all vellum, parchment, and paper liable to the duties hereby charged, shall, before the same shall be engrossed, printed, or written upon, be brought to the head office for stamping," and be stamped according to the duties payable under that Act.

In *Ex parte Morris Roth* (22 W. R. 329) the father of an articulated clerk, being advised (see *Ex parte Hayward*, mentioned above) that the articles could be stamped at any time within six months after execution, did not have them stamped at the time of their execution. Then came losses in business, and the articles were not stamped until the expiration of three years from their date. The Court of Queen's Bench refused an applica-

tion to allow the service to count from the execution of the articles. The following extracts from the judgment of Blackburn, J., show the view taken by the court:—"By the requirement that service must be under articles stamped and enrolled, it is intended not only to protect the interests of the revenue, but also to provide a security for the *bona fides* of the parties. It does, no doubt, furnish a guarantee of the respectability of the person who executes the articles as well as providing for the interests of the revenue. Where a person is deceived the case is different, but here there was full knowledge of the circumstances, and all that is alleged in excuse is what is called an emergency. It would be a cruel kindness to allow this application. The result would be that the poorer clerks would delay paying the stamp duty till they were just ready to be admitted, and then come here at a great cost and apply to us on such an emergency as is alleged in this case."

Our readers will doubtless recollect the case of personation at the final examination in 1872, when an article clerk, named Clements, was personated by an attorney, who has since been struck off the rolls for the offence (16 S. J. 633). In June, 1873, Mr. Clements applied for a rule directing him to be examined, but his application was refused. He had since been employed as a managing clerk to a solicitor, and in June this year he renewed his application, which, if granted, would have been carried out by his being examined in this present Michaelmas Term, at which time he would have suffered suspension for two years and six months. In support of his application he filed eleven affidavits from solicitors and others in his place of residence, all of which spoke to his good conduct during the past year. The Court of Queen's Bench said that, considering the very serious nature of the offence, the application was premature, and declined to specify any time at which it might be renewed (*In re T. B. Clements*, 18 S. J. 608).

The case of *Ex parte Greville* (22 W. R. 160, L. R. 9 C. P. 13), is not of very great practical importance since the passing of the Attorneys and Solicitors Act (37 & 38 Vict. c. 68), which received the Royal Assent on the 7th August, 1874. It is however interesting as having contributed to the change made by that Act. Mr. Greville, during his articles, accepted an appointment as vestry clerk, which had become vacant by the death of his father. It was shown that he had done the laborious work of this office by deputy, and generally that his appointment had not interfered with his duties or studies as an article clerk. The Court of Common Pleas, however, "though with regret," held that he had contravened section 10 of 23 & 24 Vict. c. 127, which enacts that no article clerk shall, during the term of his service, "hold any office, or engage in any employment whatsoever, other than" his employment as "article clerk to his principal; and they declined to yield to the argument that the words "other than" meant "inconsistent with." With respect to the case of *Ex parte Peppercorn* (14 W. R. 693, L. R. 1 C. P. 473), where an article clerk, jointly interested in a manor, became steward of the manor during his articles, and it was held that he had not infringed the statute, the court in the present case came to the conclusion that the judgment must have been upon the ground that the words of the section were satisfied, and that no office was held within the meaning of them. Of the correctness of the decision in *Re Greville* there could be no doubt; nor could it be denied that cases frequently occur in which the strict, and indeed only permissible, interpretation of the 10th section would work hardship without causing any corresponding gain. As our readers are aware, the severity of the Act of 1860 in this respect has been tempered by the Act just passed. By the fourth section of that Act it is provided that section 10 of the former Act shall henceforth (*i.e.*, from 7th August, 1874), not apply to cases where, before or after entering upon the office or employment, the article clerk shall have obtained the written consent of his employer and the sanction of a judge of one of the superior courts at Westminster, or the Master

of the Rolls, or a judge of the coming High Court. This relaxation of the old rule is to apply to clerks whose articles shall expire or had expired after, or not more than two years before, the passing of the recent Act; and in all cases the office or employment must have been undertaken with the employer's leave, and must not have interfered with the clerk's due service under his articles. The Act contains divers provisions with reference to the exercise of the power thus conferred upon the judges; but as we have summarised it so lately (18 S. J. 875), we need not here refer to these provisions.

To *Ex parte Greville* we may add the case of *In re an Article Clerk* (18 S. J. 204), where, in fear of the operation of section 10 of the Act of 1860, and before the passing of the recent Act, a clerk applied to the Court of Queen's Bench to be allowed to be discharged from his articles, and to enter into fresh ones, under the following circumstances:—On the 19th April, 1873, he obtained a commission as lieutenant in the Militia, and went out with his regiment for twenty-seven days. On the 9th of December he resigned his commission. Fearing that he had brought himself within the section in question, he made the application which we have described, and which was granted by the court.

The above cases on article clerks are all the cases of the kind reported during the past legal year. Next week we shall proceed to give a summary of some of the cases affecting admitted solicitors.

## Recent Decisions.

### EQUITY.

#### GIFT OF SURPLUS AFTER SATISFACTION OF PURPOSE WHICH FAILS.

*Dawson v. Small*, V.C.B., 22 W. R. 514, L. R. 18 Eq. 114.

There has been some conflict of judicial opinion as to the rule to be adopted with reference to a bequest of the surplus of a fund after providing for a charitable purpose which the law does not permit to be carried into effect. Is the amount of the surplus contemplated by the testator to be ascertained wherever it is possible to do so—that is, in all cases where the testator has afforded sufficient data for an inquiry as to how much would be required to satisfy the purpose which fails—or is the gift of surplus in all these cases to be held too indefinite for the court to execute? Sir William Grant, in *Chapman v. Brown* (6 Ves. 404), laid down the former rule, although in the particular case he held that as the testatrix had not given any grounds for ascertaining the probable expenditure on the purpose which failed, the gift of the surplus was too indefinite. The purpose which failed in that case was the erection or purchase of a chapel, and Sir W. Grant intimated that if the testatrix had even only mentioned the place where the chapel was to be built, that might have furnished some ground of inquiry as to what size of building would be sufficient for the congregation to be expected there. This view was expressly approved by Lord Lyndhurst in *Mitford v. Reynolds* (1 Phil. 185), was recognised by Wood, V.C., in *Cramp v. Playfoot* (4 K. & J. 479), and seems to have been noticed with approval by Lord Chancellor Chelmsford in his judgment in *Magistrates of Dundee v. Morris* (3 Macq. 134).

On the other hand, in *Attorney-General v. Hinzman* (2 J. & W. 270), where the testator had furnished grounds for ascertaining the probable expenditure on the purpose which failed, Sir Thomas Plumer, M.R., instead of directing an inquiry upon this subject, declared the gift of the surplus void for indefiniteness. And in *Limbery v. Gurr* (6 Madd. 151), where the testator had actually made an estimate of the cost of providing for the void purposes, but left a discretion to his executors as to the amount to be employed on them, it



was held that, by reason of this discretion, the amount of the overplus was incapable of being ascertained.

In this state of the authorities a new distinction was introduced. In *Fisk v. Attorney-General* (15 W. R. 1200, L. R. 4 Eq. 521) there was a bequest of a sum to the rector and churchwardens of a church upon trust to receive the annual proceeds and apply such part thereof as should from time to time be required in keeping in repair the testator's family grave, and to pay the residue of the proceeds to a charitable purpose. Vice-Chancellor Wood admitted that according to the view of Sir W. Grant and Lord Lyndhurst an inquiry ought to have been directed as to how much would have been required to repair the grave. But he held that the rector and churchwardens were entitled to receive the whole fund, freed from the void trust relating to the family grave. The gift, he said, was not to the executors to do certain things and to pay the residue to the rector and churchwardens; it was an out and out gift to the rector and churchwardens for a valid purpose, subject only to an invalid condition. This construction was adopted by Bacon, V.C., in *Hunter v. Bullock* (20 W. R. 460, L. R. 14 Eq. 45), where the gift was very similar, and has been again applied by the same learned judge in *Dawson v. Small*, where the facts were that a testator bequeathed £600 to his executors and executrix to be invested and the income applied to keeping up in good repair certain tombstones. And he directed that "any surplus money that may remain after defraying yearly the expenses as before stated" be given to poor pious members of the Methodist Society, the distribution of the surplus interest being directed to be made by his executrix. The learned Vice-Chancellor held that the whole £600 went for the benefit of the Methodist poor, discharged from the obligation to keep the tombstones in repair. The case is probably within the principle of *Fisk v. Attorney-General*, but until the somewhat slender distinction drawn in that case, between a gift of surplus after satisfying the void purpose and a gift out and out subject first to the fulfilment of the void purpose, has been sanctioned by the Court of Appeal, it would not be safe to assume that the doctrine of *Chapman v. Brown* has ceased to be applicable to this class of cases.

## COMMON LAW.

### PARTNERSHIP—EXPULSION OF PARTNER.

*Wood v. Wood, Ex.*, 22 W. R. 709, L. R. 9 Ex. 190.

Although the discretionary exercise of powers given, whether by statute or by contract, to a majority or a representative body to bind the interests of a minority, or of individuals, will not be interfered with by the court (*Ex parte Penney*, 21 W. R. 186, L. R. 8 Ch. 446), yet it is equally clear that the power must be exercised honestly, and that if not exercised *bona fide* for the interest of the whole body, the acts assuming to be done under it will be invalid. In the case of statutory and quasi-statutory powers this was admitted in *Ex parte Penney*, and was acted on in *Robinson v. Chartered Bank* (14 W. R. 71, L. R. 1 Eq. 33); the same principle was also recently applied to the action of a majority of shareholders, *Messier v. Hooper's Telegraph Company* (L. R. 9 Ch. 350). And in bankruptcy both branches of the rule are exemplified by *Ex parte Cowen* (15 W. R. 859, L. R. 2 Ch. 563); *Richmond Hill Hotel Company* (16 W. R. 57, L. R. 3 Ch. 10); *Ex parte Deacon* (L. R. 4 Ch. 87); *Hart v. Smith* (17 W. R. 158, L. R. 4 Q. B. 61). And in the case of a private partnership the rule was acted on in *Blissett v. Daniel* (1 W. R. 529, 10 Hare, 539). The last mentioned case has been followed in *Wood v. Wood*, with the curious result that the plaintiff, who complained of a dishonest exercise of their powers by a managing committee in expelling him from the partnership without a hearing, was held not entitled to succeed, on the ground that if the act was in fact such as he described, it was absolutely invalid and without effect, and could, therefore, give him no cause of action. The case would be of

more authority if the views taken by the learned judges who decided it were less various and the reasoning more satisfactory; but, without examining the judgments in detail, the decision must, we think, be taken to be as above stated.

## Reviews.

### RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF NEUTRALS.

THE RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF NEUTRALS. By WILLIAM EDWARD HALL, Barrister-at-Law. Longmans, 1874.

In his "Rights and Duties of Neutrals" Mr. Hall has presented us with a treatise of considerable value on a very important head of international law, and one which, according to recent experience, is peculiarly liable to furnish matter for international controversy. The inherent uncertainty of this, as well as of other branches of international law, has been much aggravated of late by the tendency of some recent continental writers to prefer theory to fact. As Mr. Hall complains (p. 3), "They not unfrequently state as an accepted rule what ought to be only put as a growing usage, or as one which it would be for the interest of all or of some nations to adopt." He justly adds, "Any confusion between well established law, and that which is still open for the acceptance or rejection of nations is not only incorrect but perilous. Its most likely result must be to make disputes, and even collisions, more frequent and more bitter." Mr. Hall therefore undertakes "to ascertain what the relative authority of conflicting usages in fact is, and to separate distinctly those which have become obligatory from those which are still in course of growth," and this pledge he has on the whole carefully carried out, making a discriminating use of the old treaties, neutrality ordinances, and other historical data which, more or less distinctly, indicate what usages have prevailed from time to time.

Although Mr. Hall is usually very careful not only to notice the older usages of International Law, but also to give them due weight as compared with any new principles or rules which may be gradually superseding them, yet occasionally upon questions of minor importance he has been too hasty in assuming old usages to have become unlawful. Instead of there being no precedent during the present century of one State lending troops to another while professing to maintain neutrality (see p. 48), both the Pope and the King of Naples had Swiss troops in their service, under military capitulations with some of the Swiss cantons, until after 1848, as France had until 1830. The Swiss federal constitution of 1848 prohibited such capitulations for the future, but the last of them did not expire until 1859 (*S. Bury, La Neutralité de la Suisse, Revue de Droit International*, 1870, p. 638.). The European powers which guaranteed the neutrality of Switzerland in 1815 cannot have considered these military capitulations inconsistent with neutrality, for the federal pact of 7th August, 1815, which created the federation whose neutrality they guaranteed, had expressly reserved to the separate cantons the right to enter into military capitulations.

As to allowing the passage of belligerent troops through neutral territory (see p. 52), Professor Bluntschli in the 1868 German edition of his *Droit International Codifié* (§ 771), pronounces it lawful when allowed in pursuance of a treaty entered into without any view to a particular war, and refers to different kinds of engagements of this kind. In Martin's *Nouveau Recueil* (vols. 4 and 5), there are a number of conventions d'étapes entered into between Prussia and various other German states stipulating for military routes through their territories, and some of these conventions were renewed in 1847 (*Nouveau Recueil*, X. pp. 578, 632). Mr. Hall's remark, that "while the greater number of

states were small, and their fragmentary possessions were strewn at random over the map, the right of passage was practically a necessity of war," only ceased in 1866 to be applicable to Germany, and may at some future time again be applicable to parts of Europe or America. We fail to see why it is, in the abstract, wrong for a neutral state to allow a passage to both belligerents, instead of refusing it to both; and even if this were morally as undesirable as we concede that military capitulations are, we do not understand how disuse for a few years can have converted either one practice or the other from legal into illegal. We observe, however, that the rules drawn up at the recent Brussels Conference will, if adopted, preclude neutral states from allowing belligerent troops to pass through their territory, an indication that Mr. Hall has probably rightly anticipated the future rule.

The following observations on the construction and fitting out of vessels in neutral territory will give a fair idea of the mode in which Mr. Hall handles his subject and of his style: "A comparison of international custom with the logical results of the unquestioned principles of neutrality seems to lead to these conclusions.

"1. That an international usage prohibiting the construction and outfit of vessels of war, in the strict sense of the term, is in course of growth, but that although it is adopted by the most important maritime powers it is not yet old enough or quite wide enough to have become compulsory on those nations which have not yet signified their voluntary adherence to it.

"2. That in the meantime a ship of war may be built and armed to the order of a belligerent, and delivered to him outside neutral territory ready to receive a fighting crew; or it may be delivered to him within such territory, and may issue as belligerent property if it is neither commissioned nor so manned as to be able to commit immediate hostilities, and if there is not good reason to believe that an intention exists of making such fraudulent use of the neutral territory as before indicated [i.e., see p. 62, by completing the crew of a vessel otherwise ready for fighting, just outside the neutral's waters].

"That the usage which is in course of growth extends the duties of a neutral state into new ground is, I think, plain, but it does not follow that the extension is either unhealthy or unnecessary. Though an armed ship does not differ in its nature from other articles merely contraband of war, it does differ from all in the degree in which it approaches a completed means of attacking an enemy. The addition of a few trained men to its equipment, and of as much ammunition as can be carried in a small coasting vessel, adapts it for immediate use as part of an organised whole of which it is the most important element. The same cannot be said of any other article of contraband" (pp. 68—71).

Mr. Hall suggests that the new rule should be limited to vessels built primarily for warlike use, and which, therefore, experts can readily distinguish, but this would frustrate the main object of the rule—viz., the protection of the belligerents' mercantile marine from cruisers fitted out in neutral ports; as some kinds of purely mercantile vessels (Mr. Hall instances large mail steamers) only require to have guns put on board to make them dangerous cruisers. We feel strongly the objections Mr. Hall urges to the form of the new rule put forward by Ortolan and Dana, which makes the liability of the neutral state depend upon the intent with which the vessel is fitted out—objections which apply almost equally to the form embodied in the Alabama treaty—but we cannot accept his remedy.

The latter part of Mr. Hall's book deals principally with subjects like contraband, blockade, and the right of visit and capture, which, from being within the cognizance of prize courts, will have greater interest for strictly professional readers than the topics of purely political international law to which our criticisms have been limited.

## LAW AS A SCIENCE AND AS AN ART.

The above was the subject chosen by Professor Sheldon Amos for his opening address to the students of the jurisprudence class at University College, Gower-street, on Thursday evening the 22nd ult.

After a few introductory remarks, the Professor said that when a young man commenced the study of law, whether by attendance in an office or chambers, or by reading Blackstone's Commentaries, or dipping into Smith's or White and Tudor's Leading Cases, or by exercising himself at a debating society in forensic disputation, he was addressing himself to the study of an art, and not of a science. He was trying to acquaint himself with the body of formal rules which made up the law of England; he was learning how, when occasion served, to elicit the rules for himself; he was familiarising himself with the modes of reasoning by which statutes were explained, and a general principle first judicially deduced out of a number of analogous decisions, and then applied to acts presenting themselves for the first time; he was preparing himself for work, for action, for life; he was studying law as an art. Up to very recent times in England the only notion of studying law had been that of studying it as an art. An exception to that statement might be made for the case of the study of the civil and canon law at the Universities, and for the sort of general legal training which at one time was sought in the Inns of Court by a much larger class of students than that of persons intending to follow law as a profession. A number of influences had been co-operating in the present century in England to bring about the discovery that law admitted of being studied as a science no less than as an art, and that there were as sufficient reasons for cultivating the knowledge of law in the former as in the latter aspect. Apart from the more general, and less easily assignable, influences conducing to the result of law being raised to a truly scientific platform, the phenomenon of Bentham's works and writings was most deserving of notice. Bentham could never be content with studying law as an art. His keen sense of moral justice, his restless logical faculty, his irrepressible political aspirations, his self-confidence ever merging into egotism and even self-conceit, wholly unfitted him for patiently and servilely learning the rules and method of English or any other system of law with the simple object of turning his arguments to direct professional account. Bentham was a moral philosopher, an English lawyer, a political revolutionist, a constructive statesman, and a remorseless critic all at once; in his writings he often figured as all at once. It was thus difficult to ascertain the precise amount of Bentham's influence in any single direction, though it has been universally confessed that his influence in all directions was incalculably great. The breadth of Bentham's interests, no doubt, of itself conducing largely to favour the scientific study of law. It began to be felt that if English law was not the perfection of reason, then there must be some reasonable standard to which the law of every country logically must, and morally ought to, conform. The indirect teaching of Bentham in the direction of legal science was stimulated and fortified by the spasm of codification which in the early part of the present century seized upon the States of Europe. There was no more favourite topic with Bentham than that one, and none to which he more persistently invited the attention of his countrymen. Mr. Austin, far more distinctly than his predecessor, conceived the existence of a distinct branch of study of a severely scientific character, and conversant with the logical principles which necessarily and invariably underlie every possible system of law. To that branch of study, dealing solely with abstractions, and relieved from the concrete technicalities of any particular system, he confined the name jurisprudence, which name he also compendiously explained to mean the "Philosophy of Positive Law." An attentive student could not read Mr. Austin's works without, perhaps unconsciously to himself, coming into the possession of a new faculty. Not only was he rapt by a new-born enthusiasm, but he discovered a rich field of interest in a quarter in which he would, unassisted, have been least likely to search for it. In a region which was proverbially the dullest, driest, and hardest, he found opening out before him the fascinating vistas of a true science which by its methods and the width of its range, at once connected his pursuits with the most alluring studies of the present age. He found himself as once transported from the dreary purlieus of a technical art into the universal sunshine of a genuine science. Although it was cheerfully conceded to Mr. Austin that he was the first



Englishman who had rescued the study of law from the somewhat grovelling associations with which it was habitually bound up, yet it was now widely admitted that he hemmed round the scientific aspects of law with too close a hedge. Since Mr. Austin's time there had been some portions of the fabric of legal science which had been coming into conspicuous relief. After some reference to the necessity of an inquiry into the meaning, origin, and import of such terms as state, constitution, marriage, infant, &c., the Professor said that the origin of law itself, as discoverable in the constitution of man and of human society, as related to man's logical and ethical nature, and as controlled by the facts of the physical universe, formed an inseparable element in legal science, though it was wholly irrelevant to law as an art. What he desired to insist upon was, that there was a specific amount of information relative to the primary institutions of social life which was indispensable to the student of the science of law. He then said that perhaps one of the most disputable points relative to the present subject was whether or not the origin and nature of what was called "The Law of Nations," or "International Law," was properly included among the topics of the science of law. It was well known that Mr. Austin relegated the whole subject to that of morals, and denied to "International Law" the name of Law, because it did not satisfy the definition which he placed on the term. That was a good instance of the peril and worthlessness of making precipitate and inelastic definitions of moral terms. Everyone knew that for a vast number of purposes rules of international law had all the qualities of rules of national law. They were cited, established, and argued upon in courts of justice in a manner in no respect distinguishable from that familiar in the case of all other rules of law. They needed the same sort of rigorous professional study, and were many of them so much implicated with rules and principles of English law, that it was impossible to master the one class without attaining to a considerable acquaintance with the other. And yet it was true that it was almost impossible to frame a compact form of words which should exactly cover, and no more than cover, the meaning of the term law in both cases. What was really common in the two meanings must be sought for in a laborious and somewhat lengthy analysis, the results of which did not admit of being shortly and compressedly stated. It must be allowed that the topics of the origin and nature (though not the contents) of the "Law of Nations," and of its leading points, was one of those which must be added to the fabric of the science of law as conceived by Mr. Austin. The topic of the abiding relation of law to the moral activity of man also belonged to the science of law. The true nature of law could only be fully expounded by a reference to the necessary and permanent limits within which its usefulness was confined; and therefore an inquiry into the place and direction of those limits, i.e., into the relation of law to morality on the one hand, and to Government on the other, was an indispensable portion of legal research. The complete study of the science of law involved, or rather presupposed, the study of much else beside. History, descriptive sociology, Roman Law, Foreign Law, and International Law, logic, ethics, and politics, were none of them alien, were most of them essential, and were all of them helpful to the fit furnishing of the student of legal science. In conclusion Professor Amos read a short extract from an address delivered by his father, thirty-four years since, to his class for the study of English Law which had then just been founded at University College, in which he alluded to the satisfactory relations existing between himself and the students.

In a case at the Hammersmith Police-court in which the defendant was summoned for not sending his child to school he handed in the following letter: "Mr. Justice Ingham. Respected Sir,—Having a very painful impediment in my speech, I beg to submit the underlined as my statement. It is my most earnest wish that my child should go to school, but that part of my domestic arrangements are entirely governed by my wife, who, I am happy to say, governs me. Therefore, most respected Sir, I hope, after your most serious consideration, you will deal with my case as leniently as possible, and I give you my solemn word never to be placed before you again. I beg to remain, Sir, your most obedient servant, George Puddiford." Mr. Ingham told the defendant that if his wife governed him with a rod of iron it would not be an excuse for not sending his child to school.

## Appointments, Etc.

Mr. JOHN MARSHALL, an advocate of the Scottish bar, has been gazetted as one of the Lords of the Court of Session in Scotland, in the room of Lord Benholme (Hercules J. Robertson), deceased. Mr. Marshall is the eldest son of the late Lord Curriehill, who was a judge of the Court of Session from November, 1852, till his retirement, shortly before his death, in October, 1863, by his wife Margaret, daughter of the Rev. Andrew Ball, of Kilsnean, minister of Crail. The new judge was educated at the University of Edinburgh, and was admitted a member of the Scottish Faculty of Advocates in 1851. He will take the courtesy title of Lord Curriehill, which was borne by his father before him.

Mr. CHARLES PACKER, Solicitor-General of Barbadoes, in the West Indies, has been appointed Chief Judge of that island. Mr. Packer was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he graduated as B.A., in 1839, and was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in January, 1841. He was appointed Solicitor-General of Barbadoes in January, 1847, and since 1859 he has also held the office of Escheator-General of the colony. In 1846 he was elected a member of the General Assembly for the parish of St. Andrew's, continuing to represent that constituency till the present time. In 1861 he was elected Speaker of the Barbadoes House of Assembly, and became a member of the Executive Council in 1863.

Mr. WILLIAM FREDERICK HAYNES SMITH, Solicitor-General of British Guiana, has been appointed Attorney-General of that colony, in the room of Mr. Joseph T. Gilbert. Mr. Smith was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Trinity Term, 1863. The Attorney-Generalship of British Guiana is worth £1,500 a year.

Mr. NICHOLAS ATKINSON, barrister, has been appointed Solicitor-General of British Guiana, in the room of Mr. W. F. H. Smith. Mr. Atkinson was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Trinity Term, 1867. The salary of this office is £500 a year.

Mr. PAYSTON PIGOTT, barrister, has been appointed Deputy Chief Constable of the county of Norfolk, in the room of Mr. Athill, superannuated. Mr. Pigott is a nephew of Sir Gallyer Pigott, one of the Barons of the Court of Exchequer, and was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in June, 1866. He is a member of the Midland Circuit, and practises at the Warwick and Birmingham sessions.

Mr. GEORGE FREDERICK COOKE, solicitor, of Serjeants'-inn, Chancery-lane, London, has been appointed registrar of the Norwich County Court, in succession to Mr. T. H. Palmer, deceased. Mr. Cooke was admitted an attorney in Easter Term, 1843.

Mr. HENRY ROGERS, solicitor, of Helston, Cornwall, has been appointed Registrar of the Helston County Court, in the place of Mr. Frederick Hill, deceased. The new registrar is the son of Mr. Thomas Rogers, solicitor, of Helston, and was admitted an attorney in Hilary Term, 1850.

Mr. EDWARD LORD, solicitor, of Dublin and Athy has been elected chairman of the Athy Town Commissioners for the year 1875. Mr. Lord was admitted in 1860 and has been for some time sessional Crown solicitor for the county of Kildare.

Mr. WILLIAM SMITH, solicitor, of Dartmouth, has been appointed a Perpetual Commissioner for taking the acknowledgments of deeds by married women, in and for the county of Devon.

Mr. WILLIAM KIRBY, solicitor, has been elected coroner of the borough of Helston, in Cornwall, in succession to the late Dr. Borthase.

The following days have been fixed for the opening of the sessions at the Central Criminal Court:—Monday, November 23; Monday, December 14; Monday, January 11, 1875; Monday, February 1; Monday, March 1; Monday, April 5; Monday, May 3; Monday, June 7; Monday, July 12; Monday, August 18; Monday, September 29, and Monday, October 25.

## Notes.

THE COURT OF APPEAL has affirmed the decision of Vice-Chancellor Bacon in *Credland v. Potter* (22 W. R. 611, L. R. 18 Eq. 350) to the effect that a memorandum of further charge (not under seal) in favour of a first legal mortgagee of land in the West Riding of Yorkshire requires to be registered under the Act 2 & 3 Anne c. 4, in order to give it priority over a registered equitable mortgage of subsequent date made without notice of the further charge. The court held that such a memorandum is a "deed or conveyance" within the meaning of the Act. It was strongly urged that the effect of the Act was only to postpone the further charge to the registered second mortgage, and simply to make it as if third in date, thus leaving the first mortgagee at full liberty to exercise his ordinary equitable right of tacking his further charge to his original security. But the court thought that such a construction of the Act would be a direct violation of the provision that unregistered deeds are to be adjudged "fraudulent and void against any subsequent purchaser or mortgagee," for value whose deed is registered.

"THE ACCOUNTANT," a new journal devoted to the interests of the body of accountants, "a field" as it very justly remarks—"where abuses and extravagances are far from infrequent," is much exercised about the relations between solicitors and accountants. One of the writers in its columns intimates that "a doubt is sometimes expressed as to whether an accountant can, under any circumstances, give a favourable opinion of a solicitor." This necessity for abuse no doubt accounts for the unfavourable opinion expressed by another writer, signing himself "J. B.," as to the arithmetical powers of solicitors. He says: "Speaking from an experience of about twenty years, I may say I have met with very few solicitors who could have become accountants if they had ever so much desired it. . . . The action of the solicitor's ingenious and subtle mind is naturally adverse in its operations from the sharp and rapid action of the vivid and concentrative mind of the accountant." Our readers may ask whether there is no possibility of discovering some means of propitiating these hostile practitioners. There is, apparently, but one. "If there is to be lasting peace between the two professions some such terms must be arranged, founded in equity and sustaining the self-respect of both. To dabble in law should be utterly renounced by accountants, and to dabble in accounts should be as completely renounced by solicitors." It is very evident that no solicitor must henceforth keep his own books if he wishes to have the "favourable opinion" of the writers in the *Accountant*.

WE HAVE MOST OF US heard of cases which have been reported contrary to the judgment of the reporters at the urgent solicitation of the bench. It may not be amiss to remind learned judges who like to see their lucubrations in print, of the advantage they enjoy in this respect over some of their American brethren. The Supreme Court of Wisconsin has recently undergone a severe disappointment, in being unable to find a publisher for an elaborate judgment prepared by the Chief Justice. We take the following account of the matter from an American legal contemporary:—"The Supreme Court of Wisconsin, some weeks ago, rendered its decision upon the constitutionality of the Potter railroad law. The question involved was one of grave importance; the interests at stake were immense; the case had been argued before the court for eight days by several of the ablest lawyers in the State. The Chief Justice prepared the opinion of the court, and, after the manner of American judges, where important questions are involved, elaborated it with much care and research. The opinion was long; it was also able, and the Chief Justice, it is said, and his friends, and the friends of the winning side—the Grangers—were proud of it, and had reason to expect that the State authorities would cause it to be printed in pamphlet form for general circulation. It was too long for the newspapers, and days and weeks passed without its being fully made public. It would cost money for the State to print it, and the longer it was

the more it would cost. The Governor of the State pondered over it for two weeks, when a brilliant idea crept through the executive brain; so says the *Milwaukee Sentinel*. The Governor sent for the clerk of the Supreme Court, and him he sent with a message to the Chief Justice. The clerk bled him to the consultation-room of the court, and delivered the following message:—"Mr. Chief Justice Ryan,—I am requested by his Excellency the Governor to ask you to cut down your opinion on the railroad case to about one-third or one-half of its present length." The Chief Justice was amazed; the associates laughed. The answer was only this: "Mr. Clerk, when Gov. Taylor, or any other man, sends such a foolish message as that to me again, don't you let me know it."

THAT USUALLY SERIOUS JOURNAL the *American Law Review*, notices the case of *Donnerschlog v. Behrens*, as follows:—Amelia Donnerschlog brought suit against Augustus Behrens, who had promised to marry her, but failed to keep his word. The plaintiff laid her damages at 200 dols. The case was heard before Mr. Justice Banyon, and Behrens not denying the principal facts alleged against him, excused himself on the ground that the plaintiff insisted, as a condition of the marriage, that her mother should keep house for the young people, and that the defendant would not agree to. "I told her," he said, "that I loved her deeply, and was ready to marry her, but did not wish to marry her mother also, who was a woman of lordly and unpleasant habits, and insisted on feeding me too much on cabbage, a vegetable I always disliked." Mr. Justice Banyon said, "which would you rather do—marry the lady and take her mother to live with you, or pay 200 dols.?" Defendant answered, "I will pay 200 dols." Judgment was then delivered by the court: "Allow me to shake hands with you; I envy your firmness. There was a period in the life of this court, Mr. Behrens, when it was in circumstances somewhat similar to your own. If it had had the moral courage which you possess, it would have saved about twenty-five years of misery and unhappiness. The alternative was presented to this court whether it would marry a young lady and her mother, or whether it would pay one hundred and twenty-five dollars in gold. The court was poor at that time. It was earning an unsatisfactory living at the restaurant business. It yielded. It took the young woman and mother-in-law, and kept the one hundred and twenty-five dollars. For a quarter of a century this court has regretted its hasty action. It is glad to meet a man who cherishes happiness more than he does money. The order of the court is, that 'the defendant stands discharged, and that the complainant, who has been trying to bring a man into slavery to a mother-in-law, be fined ten dollars and costs.'"

On Tuesday last, in the Court of Queen's Bench, say the *Times*, Mr. Grantham moved that an attorney might be called upon to answer the matters in an affidavit as to alleged misconduct; but the officers of the court pointed out that by an Act of last session (cap. 68) it is provided that notice of such application must be given. The Lord Chief Justice observed that the learned gentleman (who is in Parliament) had not yet had time to make himself master of the Acts of last Session. Mr. Grantham confessed that he had not, and Mr. Justice Blackburn observed that he was not himself aware of the Act.

On Thursday, the 22nd ult., the St. Albans Liberty Quarter Sessions were held for the last time, since on the 1st January next the new Act will come into operation by which the old Liberty jurisdiction is abolished, and the county divided into two nearly equal portions. Mr. Woollett, as the senior member of the bar, stated that it would be a great convenience to the counsel attending the sessions if the day of holding the sessions for the St. Albans Division of the county were altered to Friday, as the Essex Sessions were held on Wednesday, and frequently lasted two days, thus often compelling counsel to desert their clients at one or other of the two places. The chairman (Mr. Robert Pryor) said that the application should be considered.

## Societies.

### LEGAL DISCUSSION SOCIETY.

This society met at the Law Institution on the 4th inst., the president, Mr. W. E. Jones, in the chair. After the election of several new members, the subject discussed was "Would the Appointment of a Public Prosecutor be Advisable?" The question was opened in the affirmative by Mr. J. E. Duggett, and, after a spirited discussion, was decided in the negative by a majority of one.

### IRISH LAW CLERKS' ASSOCIATION.

A sub-committee was recently appointed of this association to consider the best means of establishing a registry of properly qualified law clerks. The following are the leading recommendations of the report agreed upon by the committee. It is proposed that the association should, with the approval of the Incorporated Law Society, endeavour to induce the judges to issue a General Order, establishing a general registry of law clerks, after the following plan:—The registry to be kept in duplicate, one copy at the Courts, and one at the offices of the Associated Law Clerks of Ireland. Upon this registry every law clerk of five years' standing whose employer would certify to his character and ability should be placed, and should receive a certificate of registration, which would entitle him to practise as a law clerk in all the offices of the Law and Equity Courts, and would confer upon him the status of a registered or associated law clerk. There should be subdivisions of this registry, upon which provincial clerks and the various grades of in-door clerks, draftsmen, costs drawers, conveyancers, engrossers, and ordinary writing clerks should be entitled to be placed, and also a supplemental registry for junior clerks, which it is suggested should be managed thus:—Every existing junior clerk should be placed upon it, upon the certificate of his employer, and as to future junior clerks, it is proposed that when a youth enters a solicitor's office he should obtain from the association a preliminary, or junior clerk's, certificate, and should have his name entered upon the roll of junior clerks. After the lapse of five years the junior clerk should be entitled to apply for a final, or senior clerk's, certificate, which should be issued to him upon his passing an examination in such branches of the business of a law clerk as should be decided on by the Council of the association. The certificates should be renewed from time to time, and the judges and masters of the courts should have power to revoke or suspend the certificate of any clerk misconducting himself. The report suggests that the views of the Council of the Incorporated Law Society and of the principal officers of the Courts should be ascertained upon the subject.

## Legal Items.

Mr. Thomas Thelwell Kelly, solicitor, of Mold, the Clerk of the Peace and under-sheriff for Flintshire, has been presented by the magistrates of that county with a handsome salver on the occasion of his marriage.

At a congregation holden at Cambridge on the 29th ult. the degree of LL.D. *Ameris causi* was conferred upon Mr. Edwin Charles Clark, late Fellow of Trinity College and Regius Professor of civil law. Mr. Clark was called to the bar at Lincoln's Inn in Trinity Term, 1862.

In reply to the Home Secretary's circular, the borough magistrates of Hanley have unanimously passed a resolution in favour of giving power to inflict corporal punishment in cases of kicking, biting, the use of the knife, and especially in all cases of wife-beating.

Among the candidates for the office of coroner of Central Middlesex, in the room of the late Dr. Lankester, are Mr. James Boulton, solicitor, of Northampton-square, and Mr. Samuel Frederick Langham, junior, of Bartlett's-buildings, solicitor, and deputy-coroner for the city of London, South-west, Westminster, and the Duchy of Lancaster.

The Great Western Railway Company have complied with the preliminary formalities, and on Friday last lodged the notice and grounds of appeal to the Queen's Bench

against the recent decision of the judge of the Reading County Court in the action brought against them by Mr. Becke, a report of which appeared in our columns last week.

At the opening meeting of the Scotch Law Society, Lord Shand delivered an inaugural address, in the course of which he advocated the institution of a Ministry of Justice, pointing out that thereby means might be taken to have the laws of England and Scotland assimilated, on the principle of adopting from each those parts which experience had proved to be sound and worthy of imitation.

The *Athenaeum* states that Mr. D. M. Aird, of the Middle Temple, author of "Blackstone Economised," &c., has undertaken a work that is nearly completed, "The Civil Law of France to the Present Time," which combines all the rules of the *Code Napoléon*. He has appended Explanatory Notes, which show the analogy that exists between the Laws of France and the leading principles of the Roman Law.

The alterations and improvements in the Middle Temple Library to which we referred a few weeks ago, have now been completed. The benchers have run up new stacks of ornamental stonework chimneys springing from solid buttresses to a height of 27 feet above the battlements and three feet above the ridge of the roof, and these, in addition to removing all source of annoyance from smoking chimneys, add considerably to the appearance of the building. The interior of the library has also undergone a thorough reorganisation. Two beautiful and elaborately-carved stone windows have been constructed at the south-east side of the building surmounting the large stained-glass window already there. These have been glazed with plain glass, and afford greatly increased light. In consequence of complaints of the coldness of the reading-room, large coils of hot air-pipes have been placed under each window, and by this means the temperature can be regulated.

At Bow-street Police-court on Tuesday, Mr. Burnaby, the chief clerk, tendered his resignation, having completed the fiftieth year of his service at the Bow-street and other police-courts. Mr. Burnaby, says the *Times*, received his first appointment as junior clerk at the Union-hall Police-office (now Lambeth Police-court) from the late Sir Robert Peel on the 2nd of November, 1824. Five years afterwards he became the second clerk at Bow-street, at which period Sir Richard Birnie sat on the bench. In 1837 he was finally appointed chief clerk by Lord John Russell, under the chief magistracy of Sir Frederick Roe, and received with that appointment the editorship of the *Police Gazette* (formerly known as the *Hue and Cry*). Mr. Burnaby has been repeatedly complimented in public by the presiding magistrates on the ability and intelligence with which he has discharged his frequently onerous duties in both capacities.

Upon the same subject the visiting justices of the Kirk-dale Division in Lancashire have presented the following recommendations to the Quarter Sessions:—"That the powers of justices in petty sessions, under the Criminal Justice Act, 18 & 19 Vict. c. 125, should be enlarged, enabling such justices to deal with persons charged with obtaining money on false pretences under the sum of £1, or with larceny where the value of the property exceeds 5s. whether such persons plead guilty or not guilty, provided they consent to be tried by such justices instead of by a jury. That, in cases of common assault, it is desirable that the maximum term of imprisonment should be increased from two to six months. That, in aggravated cases of assault upon either men, women, or children, the maximum term of imprisonment should be increased from six to twelve months, with the additional power of awarding a flogging; and that the power of awarding whipping with a birch-rod to boys under fourteen years of age be extended to the age of sixteen. That one justice, instead of two, should be empowered to convict for offences under the Highway Acts, as is already the case under the Turnpike Acts—namely, for riding without reins; riding asleep in carts whilst the same are passing along the roads, and for being at a distance from carts so as not to have the government of the horse or horses drawing the same, &c., &c. That one justice (now two) be empowered to hear summonses for non-payment of poor rates, and to issue warrants for the recovery of the same, as already one justice is empowered to issue warrants of distress for recovery of rates under the Public Health Acts."



## Law Students' Journal.

## NOTICES OF ADMISSION.

NOTICES OF ADMISSION FOR MICHAELMAS TERM, 1874.

- Abbott, Frederick James.—Articled to Robert Benjamin Wheatly, 7, New inn
- Addyman, James Wilson.—Frederick H. Barr, Leeds
- Allingham, Theodore Frederic.—Frederick M. Calcott, 52, Lincoln's inn fields; John W. A. Calkin, Rugby chambers
- Anty, Samuel Bates.—William Carr Anty, Sheffield
- Ashington, Henry, the younger.—Henry Peake, Sleaford
- Badger, Henry Walter.—Thomas T. Dibb, Leeds
- Baker, Francis John.—William Clarke, Rugby chambers
- Ball, John Charles.—Henry Toogood, 16, Parliament street
- Barker, Alfred.—Frederick J. Blake, South Sea House
- Bayley, Fewster Johnson.—Alfred Hooker, Plymouth
- Biggin, Edward Henry.—George Richardson, Manchester; Jasper Gibson, 64, Lincoln's inn fields
- Birchall, Charles Francis Bullard.—Benjamin W. Nind, 4, Saint Benet place
- Biscoe, Frederick William.—Charles W. Lawrence, Cirencester
- Black, Frederic Theodore Cornelius.—Wilbraham Mangnall, Bolton; William Dowling, Bolton; Charles E. Abbott, 52, Lincoln's inn fields
- Blair, Robert.—John Salmon, South Shields
- Bollingbroke, Louis Errington.—Elijah C. Bailey, Norwich
- Borlase, John James.—Henry Rogers, Helston
- Brett, Arthur.—William R. Richardson, Bristol
- Brown, Richard Seneade.—George A. Crowder, 55, Lincoln's inn fields
- Bruce, Francis Henry.—Henry Clark and Charles A. Collins, Trowbridge
- Burchell, James Ward.—William Burchell, the younger, 5, Broad Sanctuary
- Burges, Frederic Travers.—D. T. Burges, 1, South square; G. Burges, 70, Lincoln's inn fields
- Buttle, William.—George Davis, 6, Old Jewry
- Byrne, Harry Widdrington.—Edmund Byrne, 3, Whitehall place
- Carpenter, Alfred Sturgis.—Alfred B. Carpenter, 3, Elm court, Temple; Charles R. Gibson, Dartford
- Carr, James.—William James Carr, Colne
- Chamberlin, Peter.—C. H. Chamberlin, Great Yarmouth; Charles Diver, Great Yarmouth
- Chapman, Robert.—Alfred Fereley, 40, Bedford row, Orbell W. Oakes, 200, Piccadilly
- Clark, Henry Hollies.—Thomas Clark, 9, Doughty street
- Cobbett, William Viner Holt.—George Finch, 40, Craven street; W. M. Fladgate, 40, Craven street
- Cockshott, Henry.—Samuel Weatherhead, Bingley
- Collard, George.—Allen Fielding, Canterbury
- Collins, Philip George.—Thomas Tilleard, 34, Old Jewry
- Cottrell, William Swinfen.—William Cottrell, Birmingham
- Cragg, Richard Balderston.—Thomas Eastham, Kirkby Lonsdale; George J. Hald, Manchester
- Curling, Percy Bunce.—Charles B. Lever, 49, Bedford row
- Dash, Thomas Henry.—Mark Whyte, Bedford
- Davis, Edward Charles.—Wilberforce Hoelias, Stroud
- Davis, James.—E. H. Bedford, 9, King's Bench walk; E. G. Saunders, 31, Carey street
- Denison, Joseph.—Alfred Legge, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
- Earl, Robert Campbell.—Wm. Gresham, 24, Basinghall street; Joseph Wyatt, 14, Bedford row
- Edwards, Stanley.—Frederick R. Partridge, King's Lynn
- Elliott, John.—John H. Taylor, Windermere; John Fisher, Windermere
- Fell, Arthur.—Henry W. Trinder, 4, Bishopsgate street within
- Foreman, Geo. Ullathorne.—Edward Leadbitter, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
- Forster, Charles Davison.—Benj. Woodman, Morpeth, Thos. F. Leadbitter, 158, Leadenhall street
- Frost, Dennis Tregase.—Richard K. Frost, Launceston
- Garsed, John Law.—Francis Jubb, Halifax
- Geddes, Charles Edward.—William D. Jeans, Warrington
- Godby, Michael John.—T. Ward, Newcastle-under-Lyme; S. H. Cooper, Newcastle-under-Lyme
- Gray, William Edward.—Weston Joseph Sparks, Crediton; Thomas William Gray, Exeter
- Haines, George William.—Philip J. W. Cooke, Gloucester; John Andrews, B.A., 12, Bedford Row
- Hales, John Baseley Tooke.—F. G. Foster, Norwich
- Hampson, Robert Alfred.—Edward Whitley, Liverpool
- Hands, John.—William F. Baker, 14, Old Jewry Chambers
- Harle, William.—W. L. Harle, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
- Haves, George.—Thomas Dewes, Coventry; William Hales, Halesown
- Hesketh, John.—Henry Atkinson, Manchester
- Hewitt, Thomas.—John Hewitt, Manchester
- Hewson, William Henry.—William North, Leeds
- Hilbery, Henry.—Francis W. Hilbery, 32, Crutched Friars
- Hill, Frederick.—Henry Hill, 30, Queen street, Cheapside; William O. Wedlake, 3, Mitre Court
- Holden, Arthur Thomas.—Thomas Holden, Bolton
- Holden, William Stackhouse.—Richard Holden, Liverpool; Richard S. Claver, Liverpool
- Hoyle, George Hardman.—William Stott, Rochdale
- Hughes, George.—Thomas V. Royle, Chester; Henry M. Cotton, 46, Chancery Lane
- Hunt, Thomas Henry Carew.—Alexander D. Druce, 10, Billiter Square
- James, Henry Willoughby.—Rowland Ticehurst, Cheltenham
- Jenkinson, John, the younger.—D. Harrison, Kendal; John H. Johnson, 47, Lincoln's inn fields
- Jennings, George William.—C. B. Hodgson, Carlisle
- Johnson, William Thomas.—Thomas Johnson, Midhurst
- Jolliffe, Arthur.—Albert Besant, Portsea
- Jones, John Henry.—A. G. Jones, Gloucester
- Jones, William Robert Lloyd.—Henry Thomas Brown, Chester
- Jupp, Richard Franklin.—Edward B. Jupp, Carpenters' Hall
- Knowles, John.—Anthony B. Creeke, Burnley
- Lamb, Richard Moon.—Daniel S. Sutton, Burslem
- Latham, Henry, Junr. B. A.—Frederick J. Blake, South Sea House, Threadneedle street
- Lea, John Henry.—Henry Galloway, Manchester
- Lees, John Edward.—Richard B. M. Lingard, Manchester
- Leigh, Enoch Taylor.—John Leigh, Manchester
- Lewes, Edward Llanfair.—Thomas Jones, Llandoverly; Charles M. Roche, 33, Old Jewry
- Lister, James Douglas.—Edmund Baxter, Doncaster
- Little, Frederick Arthur.—T. M. Croome, Cairncross, near Stroud; E. C. Little, Stroud
- Llewellyn, Arthur Price.—Thomas Llewellyn, Tanstall; Henry W. Ackrill, Tunstall
- Locke, William James.—Edward H. Pace, Pershore
- Lomer, Walter Randall.—Walter S. Lomer, Southampton
- Lynch-Blosse, Harry Francis.—William C. Luard, Cardiff
- Makepeace, Thomas.—Frederick Wills, Birmingham
- Marston, Arthur.—Richard Marston, Ludlow
- Martin, John Wesley.—Alexander Beale, Reading
- Maule, Montagu George.—Daniel J. Evans, Stamford
- Maurice, Edw. Arth. Bonner.—John Marmaduke Teesdale, 6, Frederick's place
- May, Morgan.—Edmund May, Reading
- Melhuish, John.—John Hollams, 40, Commercial Sale Rooms
- Meredith, John Frederic James.—Alfred Brittan, Bristol
- Middlemore, Richard.—William Blackmore, Liverpool
- Milles, Charles William.—George G. Buckston, 8, Whitehall place
- Molesworth, Alexander.—Richard H. T. Roper, Rochdale
- Morris, John Whitlock.—John Morris, Cardiff
- Moses, Henry William.—Robert H. Mounsey, Carlisle; Thomas W. Laing, 10, John street
- Nelson, Reginald Carter.—John W. Dauby, Lincoln
- New, Herbert, junior.—Herbert New, Evesham
- Nicholls, John.—William Sturt, 14, Ironmonger lane
- Norman, G. Boulter Bathurst.—George L. Norman, 39A, Old Bond st
- Norris, George Henry.—Henry Wood, Manchester
- North, Harold James.—David Thomas, Brecon
- Paice, Charles.—John Cross, 9, Staple inn
- Palmer, Walter Howitt.—Augustus Hawks, Hertford
- Paynter, James Bernard.—C. O. Newman, 12, Lincoln's inn fields; E. Newman, Yeovil
- Pearce, William.—James Pearce, 8, Giltspur street
- Pitt, William Alfred.—Augustus G. Stevens, Bristol; W. L. Gane, 85, Gracechurch street
- Ponsonby, John Harrison.—John Ponsonby Oldham
- Pope, Horace Kelway.—John Daw, Exeter
- Pugh, Charles Frederick.—George M. Salt, Shrewsbury

Powell, Jas. Leslie Grove—Jas. Powell, Chichester; Chas. N. Longcroft, 14, Buckingham street, Adelphi, and Havant; Chas. J. Longcroft, Havant  
 Randall, William Richard—E. N. Bellingham, Swansea; F. Edgelow, 544, Bishopsgate street within  
 Rands, George William—George Rands, Northampton  
 Richardson, Morris—William Small, Burton-on-Trent  
 Rodgers, John Jarvis—Jesse Nickinson, 51, Chancery lane  
 Roffe, Charles Marcihoff—James Banner Newton, Liverpool  
 Rooke, Alex. Frederick—Thomas F. Inman, Bath  
 Rothera, Charles Lambert—H. H. Carter, Nottingham; G. B. Rothera, Nottingham  
 Rowley, Thomas Edward—Thomas Homer, Brierley Hill  
 Ryott, William Hall—E. Glyn, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; C. U. Laws, Newcastle-upon-Tyne  
 Scott, Walter—Morgan Morgan, Cardiff  
 Selleck, George Henry—Richard R. Rodd, Plymouth  
 Shaw, Edward—Thomas B. Burland, South Cave  
 Smedley, Robert William—Robert Smedley, Peterborough; William Hayes, Halesowen  
 Smith, Henry Joseph—William F. Baker, 14 Old Jewry Chambers  
 Smith, John Edward—William Henry Powell, Birmingham  
 Smith, Theodore John—William G. Mace, Tenterden  
 Spiller, Fredk. Hutchinson—Charles William Dommert, 20 Gutter lane  
 Stanbury, Francis Richard—Gustavus Gidley, Plymouth  
 Street, James Lacy—Henry W. Cobb, Salisbury; Thos. F. Robins, 9 Tokenhouse yard  
 Sykes, Benjamin Corless—Francis T. Maddock, New Brighton  
 Taylor, William Henry—Samuel T. Nicholls, Bridgnorth  
 Theod, Arthur Gibson—Fras. Leech, 10 Lancaster place; W. Woodall, 26 Parliament st.  
 Toppin, Sidney—Edwd. Sanders, 9 Cloak lane; Henry S. Hubbard, 23 Long lane  
 Trenchard, Hy. Montague—Henry C. Trenchard, Taunton  
 Trevanion, Henry Thomas—G. W. Millard, 137 Fenchurch St.; C. Webster, Axburgh  
 Vaisey, Arthur William—John Mullings, Cirencester  
 Vaughan, George—J. F. Thurstans, Wolverhampton; B. T. Cartwright, Wolverhampton  
 Vaughan, Geo. Lingard—Messrs. Vaughan & Son, Heaton Norris  
 Wake, Robert—Arthur Wightman, Sheffield  
 Walker, John Charles—Charles S. Burnaby, East Bedford  
 Wallis, Alfred—William Stott, Rochdale  
 Wearing, James—George Edward Moser, Kendal  
 Whall, Charles Albert—John Whall, Workop  
 Whitehead, John—Henry T. Darvyn, Ashton-under-Lyne  
 Whitting, Edward Morgan—Henry Brittan, Bristol  
 Whittle, Frederick—Augustus Helder, Whitehaven  
 Wiggins, Samuel—Rowland Miller, 6 Copthall court  
 Willocks, John Love—Alfred Rooke, Plymouth  
 Williams, Harry Montague—W. Greaves, 2, Raymond Buildings; W. J. Montague, Brighton  
 Wolston, Art. Chas. Reinhold—Richard R. M. Dan, Exeter  
 Woolley, George Henry—William J. Woolley, Loughborough  
 Wright, Frederic Robert—Edmund K. Byth, 10 St. Swithin's lane  
 Yates, Hercules Campbell—Alfred Leaf, Manchester

NOTICES OF ADMISSION FOR MICHAELMAS TERM, 1874, PURSUANT TO ORDER.

Argles, Nipn. Frederick—Wm. Flux, East India avenue  
 Brooks, Edward—Robert Hart, 25, Chancery lane  
 Carey, Joseph Williamson—Charles H. Lockett, Liverpool  
 Dunn, James Edward—John Thomas Treherne, Ramsgate  
 Harrison, Alfred Ernest—John B. Holroyde, Halifax  
 Hicks, William—Francis Farson, 21, Great George street  
 Macdougall, Henry—John James Coulton, King's Lynn  
 Norris, Henry Joseph—Anthony Norris, 2, Bedford row  
 Page, Frederick Brookes—William S. Page, 81, Baker street  
 Peckham, Henry Robert—R. Peckham, 17, Gt. Knight Rider street; R. Chandler, 2, Backlersbury  
 Robson, William Snowdon—James Henry Ingledew, Newcastle-upon-Tyne  
 Roskill, Aloysius Joseph—Charles M. Swarbrick, Thirsk  
 Shackleton, Wm. Frederick—Francis Jubb, Halifax  
 Thorold, Geo. Aubrey Wm.—James Crowdy, 17, Sergeants' inn  
 Whitfield, John—William James Plant, Preston  
 Wright, Edward Walter—Richard Marrack, Truro

NOTICE FOR ADMISSION IN MICHAELMAS VACATION, 1874.

Fry, John—Frank William S'ons, Tunbridge Wells  
 Hobbs, Charles Thomas—John McMillin, 39, Bloomsbury square  
 Osborne, William—John Salmon, South Shields  
 Perry, Roger Eustace—Chas. B. L. Norgate, East Dereham, Norfolk; Edwd. D. Mellor, 2, Harcourt buildings, Inner Temple  
 Phillips, Charles Arthur—W. S. Wood, Pontefract; R. L. Rooke, Leeds  
 Taylor, George Edwd. Moore—Thomas Barneby, Worcester  
 Webb, William—C. H. Willshire, Great Yarmouth  
 White, Geo. Fairfax Moresby—Robt. A. White, Grantham  
 Lincoln; Chas. Burney, 40, Chancery lane

NOTICES FOR ADMISSION IN TRINITY TERM, 1874, PURSUANT TO ORDER.

Ashdowne, Thomas—J. B. Hensman, Northampton; J. W. Sykes, Saint Swithin's lane, City  
 Beall, Edward—J. S. Mercer, 1, Copthall court; W. Curtis, 12, Queen Victoria street  
 Beck, William Michael—William Beck, East India avenue, Leadenhall street  
 Davies, Henry—John Broughall, Shrewsbury  
 Grettin, William Arthur—Thomas Heath, Derby  
 Hayes, Arthur George—Thomas Dewes, Coventry; William Hayes, Halesowen  
 Lomas, Charles—John F. Andrew, 8, George Yard, Lombard street  
 Parish, Henry—John Jelf, Birmingham  
 Potter, Henry Samuel—Edward Knight, Manchester  
 Russell, John Howard—Josiah J. Merriman, 23, Queen street  
 Sargent, Zwingli—Ebenezer Sargent, Birmingham  
 Smedley, Robert William—Robert Smedley, Peterborough; William Hayes, Halesowen  
 Whitworth, Reginald—Edmund Whitworth, Manchester  
 Young, Walter, LL.B.—Thomas Young, 29, Mark lane

NOTICES FOR ADMISSION IN TRINITY VACATION, 1874, PURSUANT TO ORDER.

Jones, Henry William—Henry Jones, Colchester  
 Lane, William Henry—Josiah J. Merriman, 23, Queen street; Alfred Powell, 28, Queen street  
 Newstead, Edward Flashman—W. H. Newstead, 18, Ely place; W. B. James, 23, Ely place  
 Page, Henry Daniel Moody—Henry Page, Southampton  
 Scowcroft, Walter—John Hall, Bolton; James Gooden, Bolton

RENEWED NOTICES OF ADMISSION FOR TRINITY TERM, 1874.

Bartlett, John—H. J. Bartley, 30, Somerset street; Charles Saxton, 30, Somerset street  
 Batten, Henry Butler—John Batten, Yeovil  
 Carr, Robert James Ewing—Edward Fairvay, 23, John street, Bedford row  
 Clarke, Edward Frederick Childs—Christopher Childs, Liskeard  
 Dixon, Alfred Gill—William Moorcliff, Cockermouth  
 Firbank, William—Charles B. Fox, Newport  
 Francis, Thomas Musgrave—W. M. Walters, 9, New square  
 George, Thomas Sanderson—William George, Bradford  
 Gosselin, Hellier R. Haisley—H. R. Freshfield, 5, Bank buildings  
 Harding, Thomas Murray—S. B. Dixon, Pawsey  
 Hargreaves, Henry—William Wheeler, Blackburn  
 Harrison, Francis Law—George Hinds, Goudhurst  
 Henderson, Alfred—E. E. Salmo, Bristol; C. F. Tagart, Bedford row  
 Hodgson, John—C. E. Bretherton, Birkenhead; James Hanne, Birkenhead  
 Hodgkinson, Alfred—E. Hodgkinson, 17, Little Tower street; O. C. T. Eagleton, 84, Newgate street  
 Livett, George Chaplin—Edmond Foster, Cambridge  
 Maxsted, Francis George—G. W. Maxsted, Lancaster  
 Norton, Joseph—Isaac Ablett, 65, Cambridge terrace  
 Owen, Morris—R. D. Williams, Carnarvon  
 Parkinson, Jno. Broadfield—J. C. Needham, Manchester  
 Shepherd, Regd. Arthur—T. Shepherd, Beverley  
 Smith, James Edward—John William Foxwick, North Shields  
 Sothorn, Frederick Boam—John Southern, Burnley; T. Nowell, Burnley

Stewart, Thomas—T. W. Stewart, Newcastle-upon-Tyne  
Temple, Henry Francis—George Masefield, Ledbury, Hereford

Walton, John Lawson—J. D. Nickinson, 51, Chancery lane  
Webb, Walter—Henry Webb, 11, Argyll street, Regent street

#### NOTICES OF APPLICATIONS TO TAKE OUT AND RENEW ATTORNEYS' CERTIFICATES.

Bartrum, John Ascott; Woodhall, Pinner (26th May)  
Coode, Frederick; 1, Hanover terrace, Peckham (23rd May)  
Gwyther, Julian; Bryntirion, Llandudno (13th June)  
Hope, Ashfield Church; 64, Camden road, and Croydon (13th June)  
Lewis, Rowland; Llandysul, and Merthyr Tydfil (13th August)  
Smythe, William Mynors; Solihull (13th June)  
Warner, Edward Lee; 6, Charles street, Grosvenor square (11th August)

#### MICHAELMAS EXAMINATION, 1874.

GENERAL EXAMINATION OF STUDENTS of the INNS of COURT, held at Lincoln's Inn Hall, on the 22nd, 23rd, and 24th, October, 1874.

The Council of Legal Education have awarded to Yarrowborough Anderson, James William Best, William Izard, Edward Majoribanks, Herbert Percival, Walter Byron Prosser, Arthur George Rickards, Arthur William Roberts, Ernest Frederic Silvester, Julian Russell Sturgis, John Bayldon Walker, of the Inner Temple, Esqs., Henry Burton, Frederic James Cornish-Bowden, John William Gustave Leo Daugars, Stephen Herbert Gatty, George William Gillow, Allan Gilmore, Francis Frederick Handley, Yves Pierre Antoine Jollivet, Henry Kisch, David Law, Richard Meares Sly, Herbert Travers Tamplin, William Wasteneys, of the Middle Temple, Esqs., Daniel Robert Fearon, Charles Albert Ineson, Andrew Lyon, Hugh Edward Pigott Platt, Arthur Thomas Waring, Thomas Rolfs Warrington, Charles Newman Watts, and Cumberland Henry Woodruff, of Lincoln's Inn, Esqs., certificates that they have satisfactorily passed a public examination.

#### HINDU AND MAHOMMEDAN LAW, AND LAWS IN FORCE IN BRITISH INDIA.

EXAMINATION OF STUDENTS of the INNS of COURT, held at Lincoln's Inn Hall, on the 26th and 27th of October, 1874.

The Council of Legal Education have awarded to Abbas Shumsoodeen Tyabjee, Esq., of Lincoln's Inn, a certificate that he has satisfactorily passed an examination in the subjects above mentioned.

#### MR. COMMISSIONER KERR ON "DEVILLING."

FOR upwards of an hour after the opening of the fourth court, at the Central Criminal Court, on Friday, although there were four cases on the list for trial, the business was at a standstill, owing to the absence in one of the three other courts, which were sitting simultaneously, of one or more of the learned counsel, who were instructed either to prosecute or defend the prisoners. After waiting some time, Mr. Commissioner Kerr observed that it might be thought degrading to take a leaf out of the book of Scotch law, but the High Court of Justiciary in Edinburgh sat every Monday throughout the year for the trial of criminal cases, and as there was consequently no accumulation or congestion of business, the court invariably got through its work early in the day. In London, however, there were but twelve sessions in the year, each of which as a rule, with four courts sitting, occupied the greater part of a week. The result was that the same counsel were engaged in most of the cases, and that a number of separate juries had to be kept kicking their heels about day after day. Perhaps it might be as well in future for the counsel to arrange among themselves when the sessions should be held, and then to bring down the judges and juries after they had completely made up their minds on the point. He thought the respectable practice of counsel who were instructed in cases handing their briefs over to others who knew nothing of the facts should be discontinued and stopped. Sir Cresswell Cresswell, an eminent counsel and judge, prided himself that

in the whole course of his professional career he had never handed over any brief intrusted to him, and it would be well if Sir Cresswell's highminded and honourable conduct in that respect could be generally followed. The system at that Court, by which a few counsel monopolised the whole of the business, and then handed over their briefs to juniors if it was inconvenient for them personally to attend to them, was simply detestable. He should like to see every prisoner insist upon being defended by the counsel whom he had instructed and paid, and by no other, and he for one would listen to any application by prisoners to postpone their trials until their own counsel could attend. He believed if he had his own way in that Court for three or four months, he should be able to put things in something like order. The learned judge, following up these observations, postponed until next sessions a case in which the defendant was out on bail, where his counsel was then engaged in another court and could not represent him. In another case a prisoner said his wife had instructed a barrister, whom he named, to defend him, but he now found that the same counsel was conducting the prosecution against him. Mr. Commissioner Kerr said there must be some mistake, for, had as things undoubtedly were, he could not believe that the same counsel would undertake to defend and prosecute the same man. It was then explained that the learned counsel in question, finding that he was instructed for the prosecution, at once returned a brief for the defence which was placed in his hands. The prisoner inquired if the money which his wife had paid was lost to him. Mr. Commissioner Kerr said he hoped not, but it all depended upon certain professional rules of etiquette, into which he could not then enter. A barrister present said it depended, in addition, upon the common honesty of the counsel. Mr. Commissioner Kerr remarked that that was a long since exploded doctrine, for the fee given to counsel was merely an *honorarium*. With that the business of the Court was proceeded with.—*Times*.

#### PUBLIC COMPANIES.

##### GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

LAST QUOTATION, NOV. 6, 1874.

3 per Cent. Consols, 93½	Annuities, April, '88 9½
4½ per Cent. Reduced, 91½	Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1908
5 per Cent. Reduced, 91½	Ex Billa, £1000, 2½ per Ct. 3 dis.
New 5 per Cent., 91½	Ditto, £500, Do 2 dis.
Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Ditto, £1000, £2000, 2 dis.
Do. 2½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Bank of England Stock, 5 per
Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '73	Ct. (last half-year), 253
Annuities, Jan. '80 —	Ditto for Account.

#### RAILWAY STOCK.

Railways.	Paid.	Closing Price
Stock Bristol and Exeter .....	100	111
Stock Caledonian .....	100	95½
Stock Glasgow and South-Western .....	100	98
Stock Great Eastern Ordinary Stock .....	100	41½
Stock Great Northern .....	100	139½
Stock Do., A Stock .....	100	154
Stock Great Southern and Western of Ireland .....	100	109
Stock Great Western—Original .....	100	114½
Stock Lancashire and Yorkshire .....	100	143
Stock London, Brighton, and South Coast .....	100	90½
Stock London, Chatham, and Dover .....	100	25
Stock London and North-Western .....	100	100
Stock London and South Western .....	100	114½
Stock Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln .....	100	74
Stock Metropolitan .....	100	69½
Stock Do., District .....	100	31½
Stock Midland .....	100	135½
Stock North British .....	100	65½
Stock North Eastern .....	100	167½
Stock North London .....	100	110
Stock North Staffordshire .....	100	85
Stock South Devon .....	100	57
Stock South-Eastern .....	100	111½

#### MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

The bank rate was not altered on Thursday. The proportion of reserve to liabilities has fallen from 38½ to about 37½. The tone of the home railway market during the week has been firm, but it closed dull on Thursday. The foreign market has also been steady, although on Wednesday there was a slight relapse and Turkish fell about ½ to 1 per cent. Business was reported as rather limited on Thursday. Consols closed on that day 93½ to 1 for money and 93½ to 1 for the account.



## BIRTHS AND MARRIAGES.

## BIRTHS.

**DOBBS**—On November 1, at 52, St. George's-square, S.W., the wife of R. C. Dobbs, Esq., barrister-at-law, of a son.

**POLLOCK**—On November 2, at 4, Chester-place, Regent's-park, the wife of Edward Pollock, Esq., barrister-at-law, of a daughter.

**POPE**—On October 30, at 4, Holyrood-place, Plymouth, the wife of John Billing Pope, barrister-at-law, of a daughter.

## MARRIAGE.

**PAIN**—BUCKBY—On October 30, at Begelly, in Pembrokeshire, Thomas Pain, of Stratfield House, Thurlow-park-road, West Dulwich, to Mary Anna, second daughter of the Rev. Richard Buckby, rector of Begelly.

## LONDON GAZETTES.

## Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

TUESDAY, Nov. 3, 1874.

Fallows, Joseph, and Spencer Whitehead, Solicitors, Lancaster place, Strand. Oct 25.

Pattison, Rowles, and William Campbell Russell, Westminster chambers, Victoria st, Westminster, and King William st, London bridge Oct 13.

## Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

TUESDAY, Oct 27, 1874.

## UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

**Bury Railway Company**.—Petition for winding up, presented Aug 11 directed to be heard before V.C. Malins, on Nov 6. Patton, Great George st, Westminster, solicitor for the petitioner.

## LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

**African Barter Company, Limited**.—Petition for winding up, presented Oct 20, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall, on Nov 6. Day, New Bridge st, Blackfriars, solicitor for the petitioner.

**Southall, Ealing, and Shepherd's Bush Tram Railway Company, Limited**.—V.C. Hall has, by an order dated Oct 21, appointed James Cooper, Coleman at buildings, to be provisional liquidator.

FRIDAY, Oct. 30, 1874.

## LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

**Cork Tramways Company, Limited**.—Petition for winding up, presented Oct 26, directed to be heard before the M.R., on Nov 7. Webb, Queen Victoria st, solicitor for the petitioner.

**Cribber Colliery Company, Limited**.—Petition for winding up, presented Oct 27, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins, on Nov 13. Jones and Starling, Gray's inn square, agents for Cathcart and Vaughan, Newport, solicitors for the petitioner.

**Foreign and Colonial Gas Company, Limited**.—Petition for winding up, presented Oct 28, directed to be heard before the M.R., on Nov 7. Puckham and Co, Knightbridge st, solicitors for the petitioners.

**London and English Bank, Limited**.—Petition for winding up, presented Oct 23, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall, on Nov 6. Mossop, Cannon st, solicitor for the petitioner.

**London and Paris Hot 1 Company, Limited**.—Petition for winding up, presented Oct 27, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins, on Nov 13. Carr and Co, solicitors for the petitioners.

## Creditors under 23 &amp; 25 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

TUESDAY, Oct. 27, 1874.

Bird, John Dent, Aldershot, Southampton, Captain 20th Hussars. Dec 31.

Hume and Co, Great James st, Bedford row.

Browne, Elizabeth, Great Dover st, Southwark. Nov 30.

Carter and Bell, Leadenhall st.

Browne, George, Great Dover st, Southwark, Floor Cloth Manufacturer. Nov 30.

Carter and B.L., Leadenhall st.

Bunn, Richard, Leonard place, Kensington, Licensed Victualler. Dec 24.

Parkers, Bedford row.

Camps, Winifred, Widow, Upper Barnsbury st, Islington. Dec 5.

James and Co, Ely place, Holborn.

Corbin, James, Lymington, Southampton, Chemist. Nov 15.

Moore and Jackman, Lymington.

Cowper, George, Exhall, Warwick, Beerhouse Keeper. Dec 8.

Jones, Alester.

Forgham, Thomas, Blackoe, Whitechurch, Salop, Farmer. Nov 27.

Jones, Whitechurch.

Irwel, Isaac, Headingley, near Leeds, Wool Merchant. Dec 14.

Berry Huddersfield.

Ivey, John, Buckingham st, Fitzroy square, Plasterer. Dec 31.

Taylor and Co, Great James st, Bedford row.

Jessop, Michael, Crich, Derby, Gent. Dec 1.

Broughall, Derby.

Kenward, William, Uckfield, Sussex, Miller. Dec 1.

Jones, Lewes.

Kerry, Sarah, Shoreham, Sussex. Dec 10.

Gower and Co, Chapside.

Lepard, Samuel, Kennington Park rd, Gent. Dec 10.

Easton, Clifford's inn.

Mitchell, John, Sunderland, Watchmaker. Oct 31.

Wright Pack, Robert, Castle st, Long Acre, Furniture Dealer. Dec 10.

Easton, Clifford's inn.

Folland, John, Dalton, York, Dyer. Dec 31.

Bottomley, Huddersfield.

Ramsay, Mary Ann, Stargrove House, Southampton. Nov 19.

Roper, Lincoln's inn fields.

Robbins, Eliza, Astor, Warwick. Dec 23.

Cutrell, Birmingham.

Robinson, Thomas, Sedgely, Stafford, Boatbuilder. Dec 15.

Round, Tipton.

Smithwaltham, George, Burnley, Lancashire, Surgeon. Jan 1.

Artindale and Artindale, Barulley.

Smith, James, Tellington rd, Holloway, Gent. Dec 1.

Greatorex, Chancery lane.

Solomon, Nathaniel Lee, Westbourne square, Merchant. Dec 22.

Solomon, Finsbury place.

Trower, Richard, Hamsey, Sussex, Farmer. Dec 1.

Jones, Lewes.

Ugwin, Thomas, Chesteron, Cambridge, Builder. Dec 24.

Whitehead, Cambridge.

Vosper, William George, Brockle, Cornwall, Yeoman. Dec 1.

Nicolls, Callington.

Wells, Richard Guy, Hickling Lodge, Nottingham, Farmer. Dec 25.

Enfield, Nottingham.

Wood, George, Birmingham, Merchant. Dec 10.

Tyndall and Co, Birmingham.

FRIDAY, Oct. 30, 1874.

Aves, John James, Colchester, Essex, Corn Merchant's Clerk. Nov 23.

Church, Colchester.

Bates, George, Lewes, Sussex, Smith. Dec 31.

Hillman, Lewes.

Bidder, George, Blackman st, Borough, Engineer. Dec 31.

Poster, Queen st place.

Bisley, Thomas Langton, Kirkham, Lancashire, Esq. Jan 23.

Beck and Dicksons, Preston.

Burrell, George Augustus, Barking, Essex, Coal Merchant. Nov 30.

Glynes and Co, Mark lane.

Dennett, Ann, Lymington, Southampton. Nov 14.

Moore and Jackman, Lymington.

Dankerley, Stanley Alexander, Oldham, Lancashire, Cattle Dealer. Nov 30.

Murray and Wrigley, Oldham.

Edwards, Charlotte, Camden rd, Camden Town. Dec 22.

Wyatt and Barrand, Arthur st West, London Bridge.

Gibbs, Mary Ann, Union rd, Rotherhithe. Jan 1.

Marchant and Purvis, George yard, Lombard st.

Grenville, Elizabeth, Liverpool. Dec 17.

Harvey and Alsop, Liverpool.

Henshaw, William, Wharves, City rd Basin, Builder. Dec 1.

East and Funston, Sion College, London Wall.

Hewison, Francis, Gwillinge, Suffolk, Farmer. Dec 9.

Kitchener and Fenn, Newmarket.

Lobley, Ann Rinder, Chapel Allerton, Leeds. Jan 1.

Simpson and Barrell.

Marriott, John, Ashford Hall, Salop, Esq. Nov 28.

Lucas and Co, Liverpool.

Marsden, Esther Elizabeth, Torquay, Devon. Nov 30.

Lucas and Lucas, Louth.

Nokes, George, Chelmsford, Essex, Butcher. Dec 15.

Child, South square, Gray's inn.

Nunn, Charles, Aldergate st, Draper. Dec 1.

Nunn and Winkworth, Princes st, Cavendish square.

Preston, Thomas, Dalton, Lancashire, Tailor. Nov 23.

Maskin, Brougham-in-Furness.

St Lo, Lewis George, Marsh Court, Dorset, Esq. Dec 24.

Melmoth and Bartlett, Sherbourne.

Scaife, George, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Gent. Dec 19.

Scaife, Edgware rd.

Sinclair, John Hartley, Brighton, Sussex, Doctor. Nov 13.

Suzkey, Brighton.

Storer, Robert, West Auckland, Durham, Grocer. Dec 9.

Trotter and Co.

Talford, Field, Sloane st, Artist. Dec 1.

Phillips, Old Jewry chambers.

Tweedale, John, Mlibbottom, York, Licensed Victualler. Nov 30.

Murray and Wrigley, Oldham.

Waddington, John, Bramhope, York, Yeoman. Dec 11.

Siddall, Orley.

Wellesley, Mary Dulcibella, Spanish place, Manchester sq. Dec 1.

Lo-man and Co, Lincoln's inn fields.

Westell, Rev John Daniel, Bishy, Suffolk. Dec 1.

Kitchener and Fenn, Newmarket.

Yalden, Rev George, Alphington, Devon. Dec 23.

Truscott, Exeter.

## Bankrupts.

TUESDAY, Oct 27, 1874.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debt to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Barr, John, Pinner's court, Old Broad st, Financial Agent. Pet Oct 22.

Brougham. Nov 10 at 11.

To Surrender in the Country.

Allott, Alfred, Lewtown, Falmouth, Yorkshire, Cloth Manufacturer. Pet Oct 23.

Robinson. Bradford. Nov 13 at 9.

Dallas, Aristides Antonio, Liverpool, Merchant. Pet Oct 23.

Watson Liverpool. Nov 9 at 2.

Forrester, Robert, Ousby, Cumberland, Farmer. Pet Oct 23.

Hulton. Carlisle. Nov 10 at 3.

Gifford, Elizabeth Stevenson, Over, Cambridge, Widow. Pet Oct 17.

Gaches, Peterborough, Nov 12 at 1.

Gill, James, Wharfedale, York, Listing Manufacturer. Pet Oct 23.

Marshall. Leeds. Nov 18 at 11.

Hooper, John, Churchill, Oxford, Innkeeper. Pet Oct 24.

Bishop. Oxford. Nov 13 at 11.

Palmer, Frederick, Snelton, Nottingham, Commission Agent. Pet Oct 23.

Pachitt. Nottingham. Nov 9 at 12.

Seabrook, Henry Pledger, Chelmsford, Essex, no business. Pet Oct 23.

Gepp. Chelmsford. Nov 13 at 11.

Shrimpton, John Charles, Chesham, Hertford, Saddler. Pet Oct 23.

Falley. Edmonton. Nov 10 at 11.

Smith, John, Blackpool, Lancashire, Lodging-house Keeper. Pet Oct 21.

Hulton. Preston. Nov 13 at 1.30.

Wright, John, Manchester, Licensed Victualler. Pet Oct 23.

Kay Manchester. Nov 19 at 3.30.

FRIDAY, Oct. 30, 1874.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debt to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Adye, Willmet L., New Kent rd, Gent. Pet Oct 28.

Roche. Nov 13 at 11.

Buchan, James, Great Winchester at buildings, Merchant. Pet Oct 28.

Roche. Nov 11 at 11.

Edington, John Darlymple, Summer rd, Peckham, Licensed Victualler. Pet Oct 27.

Brougham. Nov 10 at 11.

Geck, Gustavus, Little Trinity lane, Upper Thames st, Merchant. Pet Oct 27. Roche. Nov 13 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Cranshaw, Elijah, Oldham, Lancashire, Provision Dealer. Pet Oct 26. Tweddale. Oldham, Nov 11 at 11  
James, Edwin, Newport, Monmouth, out of business. Pet Oct 28. Roberts. Newport, Nov 18 at 11  
Jacques, Robert, Nottingham, Hair Net Manufacturer. Pet Oct 20. Patchitt. Nottingham, Nov 16 at 12

#### Liquidation by Arrangement.

##### FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, OCT 23, 1874.

Abrahams, David, Stanmore, Middlesex, Farmer. Nov 10 at 11 at 29, Cater lane, Doctors' commons. Crammond  
Adamson, Samuel James, Nottingham, Baker. Nov 6 at 12 at offices of Belk, Middle pavement, Nottingham  
Baber, Alfred Ernest, Bristol, General Haulier. Oct 31 at 11 at offices of Pitt, Albion chambers East, Bristol. Essary, Bristol  
Baddelley, George Charles, Lower Whitecross st, Paper Agent. Nov 5 at 12 at offices of Plunkett, Gutter lane  
Barr, John, Pinner's court, Old Broad st, Financial Agent. Nov 10 at 2 at offices of Harrison, Fowke's buildings, Great Tower st  
Beaumont, Edward, Mirfield, York, Tailor. Nov 6 at 3 at offices of Chadwick and Sons, Church st, Dewsbury  
Besell, Charles, Mark lane, Wine Merchant. Nov 5 at 12 at offices of Quilter and Co, Moorgate st. Broughton, Finsbury square  
Benjamin, Benjamin, Mile End rd, Clothier. Nov 3 at 12 at 145, Cheapside. Barnett, New Broad st  
Bennett, James, Garway, Hereford, Farmer. Nov 6 at 12 at the Swan Hotel, Ross. Cathcart and Vaughan, Newport  
Bennett, Stephen, Normanton, York, Tailor. Nov 5 at 2 at the Royal Hotel, Wood st, Wakefield. Fawcett and Malcolm  
Boughiey, Joseph, Crewe Town, Cheshire, Grocer. Nov 9 at 10 at the Royal Hotel, Crewe. Brooke, Nantwich  
Box, John, Harry Green, near Carlisle, Skinner. Nov 9 at 11 at offices of Donald, Castle st, Carlisle  
Chambers, John Horatio, and Thomas Chambers, Birmingham, Poultry Dealers. Oct 31 at 10.15 at offices of East, Colmore row, Birmingham  
Clarke, Elijah, Castleford, York, Draper. Nov 5 at 3 at offices of Stocks and Nettleton, Welbeck st, Castleford  
Clements, John, Balsall Heath, Worcester, Poulterer. Nov 4 at 2 at offices of Maher and Poncia, Temple st, Birmingham  
Cohen, Ely Joseph, Manchester, Jeweller. Nov 5 at 3 at the Clarence Hotel, Spring gardens, Manchester. Sampson, Manchester  
Cranston, Thomas, Monkwearmouth, Durham, General Dealer. Nov 3 at 10 at offices of Hippo, Norfolk st, Sunderland  
Crow, George Towler, Wainfleet All Saints, Lincoln, Brewer. Nov 9 at 2 at the Woolpack Inn, Wainfleet. Bassitt  
D'Andria, Michel Nicholas, Liverpool, Candied Peel Manufacturer. Nov 4 at 3 at offices of Addleshaw and Warburton, King st, Manchester  
Deut, William Alexander, Ebbw Vale, Monmouth, Ironmonger. Nov 6 at 2 at offices of Barnard and Co, Albion chambers, Bristol. Beckingham, Bristol  
Dickinson, John Francis, Boxley Heath, Kent, Commercial Clerk. Nov 4 at 3 at offices of Berridge, Duke st, Manchester square  
Dixon, Thomas, and Charles Dixon, Leeds, Dyers. Nov 4 at 12 at offices of Ward and Son, Bank st, Leeds  
Downey, James, sen, Chesterfield, Derby, Draper. Nov 6 at 2 at offices of Gee, Fig tree chambers, Sheffield  
Dye, Robert Page, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk, Miller. Nov 14 at 2 at the Guildhall, Bury St Edmunds. Gross  
Elder, William, Berwick-upon-Tweed, Engineer. Nov 5 at 12 at offices of Dunlop, Quay walls, Berwick-upon-Tweed  
Elliott, John, East Jarrow, Durham, Iron Manufacturer. Nov 3 at 12 at offices of Watson, Pilgrim st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne  
Ellis, Ellis, and Henry Ellis, Cockspur st, Pall Mall, Merchants. Nov 9 at 2 at offices of Copp, Essex st, Strand  
Friedrich, John Charles, Fifth st, Soho, Meerschaum Pipes Manufacturer. Nov 2 at 1 at offices of Sydney, Leadenhall st  
Fryer, Edward Albert, Lytham, Lancashire, Licensed Victualler. Nov 9 at 11 at offices of Buck and Dicksons, Winckley st, Preston. Nutt, Brabant court, Philip lane  
Garbutt, John, Bradford, York, Dyer. Nov 5 at 3 at offices of Lees and Co, New Regate, Bradford  
Gledhill, Albert, Wokingham, Berks, Solicitor. Nov 4 at 2 at Anderson's Hotel, Fleet st. Cooke  
Goldsmith, Arthur, Aylebury, Buckingham, Innkeeper. Nov 6 at 2 at Reader and Son's Auction Rooms, Temple st, Aylesbury. Reader, Gray's Inn square  
Gow, John, Sheffield, Draper. Nov 6 at 2.30 at offices of Binney and Sons, Queen st chambers, Sheffield  
Hall, Thomas, and William Hall, Ecclehill, York, Stuff Manufacturers. Nov 7 at 10 at offices of Watson and Dicksons, Victoria chambers, Bank st, Bradford  
Hazelton, Victor Isaac, Upper Marsh, Lambeth, Licensed Victualler. Nov 11 at 2 at offices of Chapman, Fenchurch st  
Hawcutt, Henry, Gosport, Hants, Coal Merchant. Nov 4 at 10 at offices of Blake, High st, Gosport  
Hill, Matthew Payne, Birmingham, Furniture Dealer. Nov 10 at 11 at offices of Blewitt, Waterloo st, Birmingham  
Hitchen, Thomas, Chorley, Lancashire, Joiner. Nov 9 at 11 at offices of Stampton, High st, Chorley  
Hogg, Robert Forster, Cannon st rd, Commercial rd East, Tailor. Nov 4 at 2 at offices of Barnett, New Broad st  
Hollis, John, Greenhebe, Lancashire, Innkeeper. Nov 6 at 11 at offices of Brodie, Duke st, Bradford  
Horstler, Richard, Scarborough, York, Grocer. Nov 3 at 3 at offices of Richardson, Queen st, Scarborough  
Howarth, John, Bolton, Lancashire, Cabinet Maker. Nov 2 at 3 at offices of Dawson and Scowcroft, Exchange st East, Bolton  
Hunt, Joseph Maltman, and John Elkington, Sparesbrook, Essex, Builders. Nov 6 at 12 at 27, Queen st, Cheshire. Marsden and Son  
Jackson, William, Birmingham, Carriage Builder. Nov 5 at 12 at offices of Rooke, Colmore row, Birmingham  
James, David Thomas, Treccynon, Aberdare, Glamorgan, Grocer. Nov 7 at 11 at offices of Phillips, Cannon st, Aberdare

Jannings, Charles John, Dagworth, Suffolk, Farmer. Nov 13 at 11 at the Fox Hotel, Stowmarket. Gudgeon  
Jenkins, Thomas, Tyroces, Carmarthen, Grocer. Nov 2 at 11 at the Mackworth Arms Hotel, Swansea. Bishop, Llandilo  
Johnson, William, and Charles Neville Johnson, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Merchants. Nov 4 at 11 at offices of Hodge and Harle, Wellington place, Pilgrims  
Lallemand, Alphonse, Storks rd, Bermondsey, French Bag-Purse Manufacturers. Nov 3 at 1 at offices of Nind, St Benet place, Gracechurch st  
Laws, Edmund, Thomas Lamb, and William Higginson, Chester, Brickmakers. Nov 10 at 11 at the Grosvenor Hotel, Chester. Cherton, Chester  
L'Aime, William, Aspley, Huddersfield, Saddler. Nov 6 at 3 at offices of Sykes and Son, Lord st, Huddersfield  
Leadbetter, William Austin, Melton Mowbray, Leicester, Grocer. Nov 2 at the Guildhall Office house, Grosham st. Altor, Stamford  
Lillie, William, Tweedmouth, Berwick-upon-Tweed, Engineer. Nov 5 at 11 at offices of Dunlop, Quay walls, Berwick-upon-Tweed  
Little, John, Oxley hey, Stafford, Draper. Nov 10 at 3 at offices of Barling, Townhall buildings, King st, Manchester  
Lynn, Matthew Daniel, Manchester, Merchant. Nov 12 at 3 at offices of Ritson, John Dalton st, Manchester  
Marnie, Alexander, Blackburn, Lancashire, Grocer. Nov 6 at 3 at offices of Addleshaw and Warburton, King st, Manchester  
Marsh, George Vernon, Guildford, Surrey, Newspaper Proprietor. Nov 4 at 2 at the Angel Hotel, High st, Guildford. Hull, Godalming  
Mason, John Joseph, Chesterfield, Derby, Licensed Victualler. Nov 9 at 12 at the Spa Hotel, St Mary's Gate, Chesterfield. Kesy, Chesterfield  
McGratner, John, Ebbw Vale, Monmouth, Draper. Nov 3 at 1 at offices of Gibbs, Commercial st, Newport  
Mekin, Richard, Cheltenham, out of business. Nov 4 at 12 at offices of Doodie, Bedford buildings, Cheltenham  
Miller, William Henry, jun, St Mary st, Woolwich, out of business. Nov 4 at 4 at offices of Wball, William st, Woolwich  
Mills, John Henry, Manchester, no occupation. Nov 7 at 12 at the Freemasons' Tavern, Great Queen st, Lincoln's Inn. Kimber and Lee  
Moore, Henry, Carnforth, Lancashire, Boot Maker. Nov 10 at 11 at offices of Johnson and Tiley, Sun st, Lancaster  
Neate, Henry, Bath, Somerset, Baker. Nov 3 at 11 at offices of Simmons and Clark, Manvers st, Bath  
Newton, Joseph Cooper, Wallingford, Berks, Coach Builder. Nov 5 at 11 at offices of Dodd, Friar st, Reading  
Post, Jesse, Milton-next-Sittingbourne, Kent, Carpenter. Nov 13 at 11 at offices of Gibson, High st, Sittingbourne  
Procter, William, Accrington, Lancashire, Grocer. Nov 5 at 3 at offices of Barlow, Dutton st, New Accrington  
Radmall, Thomas George, Gracechurch st, Wine Merchant. Nov 2 at 3 at offices of Howell, Cheapside  
Reeves, John, Birmingham, Jeweller's Factor. Nov 6 at 3 at offices of Jacques, Cherry st, Birmingham  
Richards, Alfred Oakes, Birmingham, Electro plate Manufacturer. Nov 16 at 3 at offices of Rowlands and Bagnall, Colmore row, Birmingham  
Roberts, John, Chester, Draper. Nov 10 at 12 at the Blossoms Hotel, Forgate st, Chester. Tatlock, Chester  
Rutherford, Robert, Thornley, Durham, Grocer. Nov 6 at 11 at offices of Salkeld, Elvet bridge, Durham  
Sands, George Alfred, Upton-upon-Severn, Worcester, Market Gardener. Oct 31 at 12 at offices of Knott, Forgate st, Worcester  
Schofield, John, Bradford, York, Herring Carer. Nov 4 at 3 at offices of Lees and Co, New Regate, Bradford  
Seoley, John Thomas, Holland rd, Kensington, out of business. Nov 7 at 3 at offices of Evans, John st, Bedford row  
Shankland, Rees, Carmarthen, Draper. Nov 2 at 11 at offices of Morris and Morris, Quay st, Carmarthen  
Simmonds, Alfred Daniel, Bristol, Haberdashery. Nov 4 at 2 at offices of Beckingham, Albion chambers, Broad st, Bristol  
Slade, John, Exeter, Builder. Nov 5 at 11 at the White Hart Hotel, South st, Exeter  
Smeiley, Samuel, Nottingham, Painter. Nov 6 at 12 at offices of Parsons, Eldon chambers, Nottingham  
Sraith, John, Nottingham, Watchmaker. Nov 3 at offices of Thurston, St Peter's chambers, St Peter's gate, Nottingham, in lieu of the place originally named  
Smith, Richard, Galsborough, York, Grocer. Nov 4 at 3 at offices of Draper, Finkle st, Stockton-on-Tees  
Smith, Thomas Cipriell, Raddington, Nottingham, Wheelwright. Nov 9 at 12 at offices of Parsons, Eldon chambers, Wheelergate, Nottingham  
Spencer, John, Farnworth, Lancashire, Stonemason. Nov 4 at 3 at offices of Rutter, Mawdsley st, Bolton  
Sutton, Peter, Eastbourne, Contractor. Nov 5 at 12 at the Crown Hotel, Lewes  
Tate, Monkhouse Bruce, and Elmond Drago, Southwick st, Hop and Seal Factors. Nov 10 at 3 at offices of Piers and Irvine, Mark lane  
Thomas, Albert, Bristol, Dairyman. Nov 6 at 12 at offices of Lyle, Lion Chambers, Broad st, Bristol  
Thomas, Henry, Clevedon, Gloucester, Draper. Nov 4 at 2 at the Bell Hotel, Gloucester. Williams, Monmouth  
Valles, Manuel, Bishopgate st Within, Merchant, Oct 31 at 1 at offices of Innes and Son, Fenchurch st  
Watkins, William John, North rd, Highgate, Grocer. Nov 6 at 3 at offices of Stokes, Chancery lane  
Whetstone, William, Oakworth, York, General Dealer. Nov 9 at 2.30, at offices of Robinson and Robinson, Kelchley  
White, Richard, Aldermanbury, Costume Manufacturer. Nov 13 at 3 at offices of Green, Queen st  
Wilson, Nathan, Blackburn, Lancashire, Cabinet Maker. Nov 5 at 11 at offices of Backhouse, St John's place, Blackburn  
Winter, James, High st, Sudwell, Cutler. Nov 4 at 2 at offices of Morris and Co, Finsbury circus  
Yendall, Joseph, Brighton, Sussex, Boatmaker. Nov 6 at 3 at offices of Ciennell and Fraser, Great James st, Bedford row. Hildham, Brighton  
Yowerd, George, Faceby, York, Tailor. Oct 29 at 11 at offices of Dobson, Gosford st, Middlesbrough

TUESDAY, OCT. 27, 1874.

Allen, Thomas Southby, Oxford, Billiard Table Keeper. Nov 10 at 11 at offices of Mallam, High st, Oxford

Arbustler, Charles James, Birmingham, Chemist. Nov 11 at 11 at the Union Hotel, Union st, Birmingham. Barlow and Smith

Ashford, William, Manchester, Builders' Merchant. Nov 12 at 3 at offices of Rideal and Shaw, Brazenose st, Manchester

Baker, Thomas Edwin, Leather lane, Holborn, Baker. Nov 9 at 12 at offices of Smith and Vickers, Southampton buildings, Holborn

Bennett, Hugh Chaffer, Stratton, Cornwall, Hotel-keeper. Nov 7 at 12 at offices of Bencraft, Bridge Hall chambers, Barnstaple

Bennion, George, Burslem, Stafford, Flashmonger. Nov 11 at 11 at offices of Tomkinson, Hanover st, Burslem

Biden, George, Southsea, Southampton, Builder. Nov 10 at 4 at offices of Walker, Commercial rd, Landport

Birkby, George Dearmingle, Cleekeaton, York, Picker Maker. Nov 16 at 2 at offices of Curry, Cleekeaton

Black, John, Birmingham, Carpenter. Nov 9 at 3 at the Stafford Arms Inn, Bristol st, Birmingham

Black, Thomas Edward, Islip, Oxford, Sargeon. Nov 12 at 11 at offices of Swears, Corn market st, Oxford

Blumenthal, Woolf, Sunderland, Durham, General Dealer. Nov 9 at 11 at offices of Hall, Villiers st, Sunderland

Blundell, Philip, Roath, near Cardiff, Glamorgan, Grocer. Nov 10 at 11 at offices of Morgan, High st, Cardiff

Bremwell, Thomas Selwyn, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Commission Agent. Nov 9 at 12 at offices of Tinley and Co, Howard st, North Shields

Brockett, John, Gateshead, Durham, Clerk. Nov 4 at 12 at offices of Woolston, Hills st, Gateshead

Brown, William Henry, St Peter's wharf, Hammersmith, Lath Ronger. Nov 12 at 13 at offices of Tilley and Liggins, Finsbury place South

Coates, Robert, Doncaster, York, Inkeeper. Nov 5 at offices of Shirley and Atkinson, St George's gate, Doncaster

Collins, Henry and William Todd Russell, Braintree, Hants, Grocers. Nov 6 at 11 at 2, High st, Southampton

Cook, Philip, East Donyland, Essex, Mariner. Nov 17 at 4.30 at offices of Jones, Butt rd, Colchester

Cooke, Henry, Hanley, Stafford, Proprietor of Billiard Tables. Nov 5 at 13 at offices of Turner, Albion st, Hanley

Cutts, Robert, Birmingham, Commission Agent. Nov 10 at 12 at offices of Collis, Bennett's Hill, Birmingham

De Bella, Arthur, Staines, Middlesex, Gent. Oct 29 at 2 at offices of O'Brien, Cooper's inn, Strand

Dewhurst, George, Wigan, Lancashire, Fruitler. Nov 9 at 2 at the Minerva Hotel, Wallgate, Wigan

Dyer, Thomas, Bristol, Tea Dealer. Nov 9 at 2 at offices of Tricks and Co, Nicholas st, Bristol

Ellen, Josiah, Landown terrace, Grove rd, Bow, Wine Cooper. Nov 7 at 2 at offices of Bartridge, Duke st, Manchester square

Evans, John, Pennant Aberarth, Cardigan, Grocer. Nov 3 at 12 at offices of Jones, Pier st, Aberystwith

Fraser, John, Swansea, Glamorgan, Draper. Nov 4 at 11 at offices of Glascombe, Fisher's st, Swansea

Gladwin, Rowland William, and Henry Norris, King st, Finsbury-square, Warehousemen. Oct 31 at 10 at the Mason's Tavern, Mason's avenue, Brown, City rd

Griffiths, David, Aberystwith, Cardigan, Tailor. Nov 13 at 12 at offices of Jones, Pier st, Aberystwith

Griffiths, William, Aberystwith, Monmouth, Draper. Nov 12 at 2 at the Angel Hotel, Aberystwith

Griffiths, Levi, and Enoch Watkin Griffiths, Treorkey, Glamorgan, Tailors. Nov 7 at 2 at the Ivy Bush Hotel, Carmarthen

Hughes and Son, Aberystwith

Gulliaume, Walter, Newington-butts, Boat Mercer. Nov 11 at 2 at offices of Harrison, Fowke's buildings, Great Tower st

Hall, Joseph, and Alfred Wellington Smith, Manchester, Builders. Nov 13 at 3 at offices of Adleshaw and Warburton, King st, Manchester

Hassamam, Christian, York terrace, York rd, Battersea, Baker. Nov 10 at 11 at 35, Walby-croft, Price, Cheshide

Harris, John Thomas, and William Henry Harris, Syston, Leicester, Coal Merchants. Nov 10 at 12 at offices of Haxby, Belvoir st, Leicester

Hatch, William, Southampton, Grocer. Nov 3 at 12 at offices of Edmonds and Co, High st, Southampton

Juxwell and Co, Southampton

Hawkins, John, Brighton, Sussex, Horse Agent. Nov 12 at 3 at offices of Lamb, Ship st, Brighton

Hayward, James, Clermont Moseley, Brighton, Sussex, Silversmith. Nov 10 at 3 at offices of Surt, Ironmonger lane

Hedger, Richard Francis, Fleet st, Accountant. Nov 7 at 3 at offices of Graham and Co, St swithin's lane

Hiley, Rev Walter, Richmond Hill, Surrey. Nov 10 at 13 at offices of Bowker, Gray's inn square

Honour, George, Brighton, Sussex, Pianoforte Dealer. Nov 10 at 12 at offices of Webb, Union st, Brighton

Hunt, Samuel, Alcester, Warwick, Baker. Nov 12 at 3 at offices of Jones, Alcester

Jones, John Morris, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Grocer. Nov 7 at 11 at offices of Barrow, Queen st, Wolverhampton

Jordan, Henry, Stockport, Cheshire, Cheese Factor. Nov 9 at 3 at offices of Marsh and Coppock, Vernon st, Stockport

Joubert, Henri Charles Rene, and Jules Joubert, Percy st, Bedford square, Upholsterers. Nov 9 at 3 at offices of Barker, St Michael's House, St Michael's alley

Kelly, Thomas Fitzroy, Brampton rd, South Hackney, Builder. Nov 6 at 3 at offices of Dubois, Grosvenor buildings, Basinghall st. Dubois at Cheshide

Lacey, Henry, High Wycombe, Buckingham, Plumber. Nov 9 at 3 at offices of Clarke, Easton st, High Wycombe

Langdale, Sampson, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Nov 9 at 12 at offices of Hoyle and Co, Collingwood st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Marten, William Haigh, Bradford, York, Woolstapler. Nov 9 at 11.30 at offices of Taylor and Co, Piccadilly, Bradford

Mauder, William Dall, Tiverton, Devon, Silversmith. Nov 9 at 11 at offices of Hawlings, Peter st, Tiverton

Martin, William, and Robert Martin, Gateshead, Durham, Glass Manufacturers. Nov 6 at 2 at offices of Hoyle and Co, Collingwood st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Mellors, William, Snelton, Nottingham, Licensed Victualler. Nov 9 at 12 at offices of Bright, jun, Town Club chambers, Wheeler gate Nottingham

Moore, Thomas, Manchester, Baker. Nov 13 at 2 at offices of Dawson, Ridgefield, Manchester

Newth, John Tom, Clarence rd, Flour Factor. Nov 9 at 4 at offices of Young and Sons, Mark lane

Nisbet, George Hunter, Tunstall, Stafford, Watchmaker. Nov 6 at 11 at offices of Salt, Tunstall

Norton, Joseph, Birmingham, Auctioneer. Nov 6 at 11 at offices of Bonarston, Ann st, Birmingham

Oats, Richard Carlines, Rehobay, Cornwall, Wheelwright. Nov 9 at 11 at offices of Boyan, Penzance

Owen, Edward, King's Cliffe, Northampton, Gas Contractor. Nov 33 at 3 at offices of Holloway, Ball's Pond rd, Islington

Phillips, Evan, Aberdare, Glamorgan, Grocer. Nov 7 at 1 at offices of Simons and Plews, Church st, Merthyr Tydfil

Porter, William Goodman, Hastings, Sussex, Soda Water Manufacturer. Nov 6 at 11 at 8, Bank buildings, Hastings

Reynolds, Meadows and Elliott, Hastings

Pockitt, William, Pontefract, York, Common Brewer. Nov 19 at 12 at Red Lion Hotel, Pontefract

Pratt, John, Luton, Bedford, Butcher. Nov 10 at 10.30 Nave, Park st, West, Luton

Pritchard, Daniel, Liverpool. Nov 11 at 3 at offices of Parkinson, Commerce court, Lord st, Liverpool

Rackham, William Matthias, Norwich, Chemist. Nov 10 at 11 at offices of Tillett and Co, St Andrew's st, Norwich

Richardson, William, Streatham, Lancashire, Clockmaker. Nov 11 at 3 at offices of Gardner and Horner, Clarence st, Manchester

Riso, Michael Constantine, and George Riso, Palmerston buildings, Commission Merchants. Nov 18 at 4 at the Alexandra Hotel, Dale st, Liverpool

Ashley and Tees, Frederick's place, old Jewry

Robinson, William, Bentfield End, Essex, Cornfactor's Agent. Nov 12 at 2 at offices of Lewis and Indermar, Chancery lane

Sloper, Edmund Hugh Linday, Hereford rd, Bayswater, Professor of Music. Nov 9 at 11 at offices of Clappell and Son, Golden square

Smith, Jacob, Colehill st, Eaton square, Clock-maker. Nov 9 at 3 at offices of Chaille, Clement's lane, Watson, Guildhall yard

Smith, Robert, Longlight, Lancashire, Joiner. Nov 16 at 3 at offices of Mann, Cooper st, Manchester

Sofley, John, South Shields, Durham, Iron Ship Builder. Nov 11 at 12 at the Central Station Hotel, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Tinley and Co, North Shields

Tate, Elizabeth, Spofforth, York, Grocer. Nov 10 at 12.30 at offices of Farmery, Knaresborough

Thompson, Richard, St Helen's, Lancashire, Wholesale Druggist. Nov 10 at 3 at offices of Qian and Sons, Lord st, Liverpool

Tilly, George, Stockwell Green, Baker. Nov 7 at 3 at 51, Thornton st, Brixton rd, Crampton

Townshend, Charles, Manchester, Fustian Manufacturer. Nov 11 at 3 at offices of Storer, Fountain st, Manchester

Trott, Laura, Ophelia, Hereford rd, Bayswater, Lodging house Keeper

Nov 5 at 3 at the Mason's Hall Tavern, Mason's avenue, Basinghall, st

Ward, Joseph, Blackley, Lancashire, out of business. Nov 11 at 11 at offices of Hankinson, St James's square, Manchester

Wells, John, Vernon rd, Tredagar rd, North Baw, General Dealer. Nov 5 at 2 at offices of Watson, Guildhall yard

West, George, Shelwick, Hereford, Farmer. Nov 10 at 12 at the Falcon Hotel, Bromyard, Corner, Hereford

Whitehead, Jane, Churchtown, Kirkland, Lancashire, Butcher. Nov 7 at 2 at offices of Cunliffe and Watson, Wincley st, Preston

Wigham, William, and Thomas Wigham, South Hylton, Durham, Iron-founders. Nov 10 at 12 at offices of Hiltson, West Barnslyside, Sunderland

Wilson, Richard Cuthwaite, Wakefield, York, Commission Traveller. Nov 11 at 3 at offices of Wainwright, George st, Wakefield

Wood, Gabriel, Eton, Buckingham, Grocer. Nov 9 at 3 at offices of Durrant, Guildhall chambers, Basinghall st

Wright, John Cole, Watton, Norfolk, Coal Merchant. Nov 17 at 11 at offices of Miller and Co, Bank chambers, Norwich

Yates, John, Runcorn, Cheshire, Tailor. Nov 16 at 3 at the Patten Arms Hotel, Warrington

Arhton and Garratt, Runcorn

FRIDAY, OCT. 31, 1874.

Abrahams, Isidore, Holloway rd, Clothier. Nov 10 at 11 at offices of Goatly, Westminster Bridge rd

Anderton, Samuel, Manchester, Glass Merchant. Nov 20 at 3 at offices of Sutton and Elliot, Brown st, Manchester

Billington, James, Leicester, Saddler. Nov 16 at 12 at offices of Morris and Son, Friar lane, Leicester

Berridge and Morris, Leicester

Branson, John, Stoke-on-Trent, Stafford, Grocer. Nov 20 at 11 at the Copeland Arms Inn, Stoke-on-Trent

Sherratt, Kidsgrove

Brine, Randolph, Caledonian rd, Baker. Nov 16 at 3 at offices of Lewis, Wilmington square

Brown, William, Byker, Northumberland, Butcher. Nov 11 at 12 at offices of Smith, High st, Gateshead

Cattle, Joseph John, Farrington rd, Engineer. Nov 16 at 2 at 17, Great James st, Bedford row, Berke

Chwick, John, Redcliffe, Lancashire, Sze Manufacturer. Nov 13 at 3 at offices of Ryance, Essex st, Manchester

Chinery, David, Gracechurch st, African Merchant. Nov 12 at 2 at the Star Hotel, High st, Maidstone

Goodwin, Maidstone

Chinery, David, Gracechurch st, African Merchant. Nov 12 at 3 at offices of Tiller and Liggins, Finsbury place South

Church, Alfred Benjamin, High st, Deptford, Draper. Nov 17 at 2 at offices of Jennings, Leadenhall st

Clark, William, Breary Banks, York, Farmer. Nov 11 at 2 at offices of Calvert, Mathan

Cocking, John Tonkin, and Stephen Michell, Penzance, Cornwall, Hat Manufacturers. Nov 10 at 3 at offices of Rodd and Cornish, Parade st, Penzance

Cox, George, Sevington, Bedford, Publican. Nov 13 at 11 at offices of Jessopp, Harpur st, Bedford



Crosbaw, George, Kingston-upon-Hull, Hairdresser. Nov 11 at 3 at offices of Laverack, County buildings, Kingston-upon-Hull

Cutting, Richard, Manchester, Bedding Manufacturer. Nov 17 at 3 at offices of Dawson, Ridsdale, Manchester

Davies, James, Tipton, Stafford, Beerhouse Keeper. Nov 11 at 10.30 at offices of Travis, Church lane, Tipton

Dooley, Edward, Stockport, Cheshire, out of business. Nov 11 at 3 at offices of Addleshaw and Warburton, King st, Manchester

Dowling, William Henry, Ilkley, York, Builder. Nov 9 at 3 at offices of Fawcett and Malcolm, Park row, Leeds

Edwards, James Henry, Queen's rd, Peckham, Bottle Beer Merchant. Nov 16 at 3 at offices of Green, Queen st, Farncombe, William, Brighton, Sussex, Grocer. Nov 17 at 3 at offices of Lamb, Brighton

Fielder, Edward (not Zedler, as erroneously printed in Gazette of Oct. 22), Milk st, Linen Agent. Nov 4 at 12 at offices of Whitwell, King st, Cheapside

Field, William James, Lee, Kent, Gent. Nov 16 at 11 at offices of May and Co, Adelaide place, London Bridge

Finchett, Samuel, Liverpool, Ironmonger. Nov 16 at 11 at offices of Queikh, Dale st, Liverpool

Foster, Joseph, Barrow-in-Furness, Lancashire, Graingrocer. Nov 11 at 11 at the Ship Hotel, Barrow-in-Furness. Bradshaw and Pearson, Barrow-in-Furness

Frubling, George Charles, and Anton Mortimore Conrath, Brabant court, Philpot lane, Commission Merchants. Nov 17 at 2 at the Cannon st Hotel, Cannon st. Parker and Co

Godsall, George, Hereford, Bootmaker. Nov 14 at 11 at the Kerry Arms Hotel, Hereford. Arthy, Hereford

Griffiths, Levi, and Enoch Watkin Griffiths, Treorhy, Glamorgan, Tailors. Nov 7 at 2 at offices of Alexander, St Mary st, Cardiff, in lieu of the place originally named

Hadley, William, West Bromwich, Stafford, Draper. Nov 10 at 12 at offices of Shakespeare, Church st, Oldbury

Harris, Phineas, Duke st, Manchester square, Chessomonger. Nov 10 at 12 at offices of Nunn and Winckworth, Prince's st, Cavendish square

Hogg, Joseph, St James's st, Piccadilly, Tailor. Nov 14 at 12 at offices of Dalton, Piccadilly

Hollingworth, Robert, Saddleworth, York, Innkeeper. Nov 16 at 3 at offices of Leary and Ledwyard, Buxton rd, Huddersfield

Howard, Nathaniel, Heap Bridge, Lancashire, Woolen Waste Dealer. Nov 13 at 3 at offices of Anderson, Garden st, Bury

Jackson, Charles, Nottingham, Lace Manufacturer. Nov 17 at 12 at offices of Brittle, St Peter's gate, Nottingham

Jackson, Peter, Dunganon House, Waltham green, Cattle Dealer. Nov 17 at 3 at offices of Downing's, Basinghall st

Johnson, George Frederick, Brighton, Sussex, Chemist. Nov 10 at 3 at 11, St Bride's avenue, F east st. Waterman, Brighton

Keeney, George, and William Marshall, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Engineers. Nov 7 at 11 at offices of Hooper, Grainger st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

King, William, Oldbury, Worcester, Boot Dealer. Nov 10 at 10.30 at offices of Shakespeare, Church st, Oldbury

Langham, Henri, Wrexham, Denbigh, Auctioneer. Nov 11 at 3 at the Lion Hotel, Wrexham

Longmore, Thomas, Morecambe, Lancashire, Confectioner. Nov 12 at 12 at offices of Sharp and Son, Cable st, Lancashire

Moore, Walter, Moredith st, Clerkenwell, Dealer in Jewellery. Nov 14 at 2 at offices of Evans and Eagles, John st, Bedford row

Moss, William, Liverpool, Cabinet Maker. Nov 17 at 3 at offices of Risson, Dale st, Liverpool

Mumford, William, Kingsthorpe, Northampton, Grocer. Nov 11 at 11 at offices of Tomalin, St Giles st, Northampton

Musgrave, Timothy, Lower Edmonton, Grocer. Nov 17 at 3 at offices of Bath and Co, William st

Nairn, George Augustus, and James Havers Nairn, Wade's place, Mile End rd, Twine Spinners. Nov 12 at 2 at offices of Lovett, King William st

Nicholls, Charles Henry, Guildford, Surrey, Colonel. Nov 13 at 2 at the White Lion Hotel, Guildford. Burdidge, Guildford

Oldcorn, Hannah Maria, Oset, York. Nov 16 at 11 at offices of Stringer, Oset

Ormerod, James, Chorlton-upon-Medlock, Lancashire, Builder. Nov 14 at 10 at offices of Lall and Son, Piccadilly, Manchester

Orrip, William, Grimsbury, Northampton, Builder. Nov 13 at 2 at the Reindeer inn, Banbury. Pain and Hawtin

Perrase, Walter James, Southampton, Ironmonger. Nov 11 at 2 at 145, Cheapside. Guy, Southampton

Popham, James Payne, Copford, Essex, Tambour Work Manufacturer. Nov 16 at 3 at offices of Aird, Eastcheap

Pruce, John, New Swindon, Wilt, Hairdresser. Nov 10 at 10 at offices of Kenner and Tombs, Corn Exchange, Swindon

Reeks, William Henry, Wimborne Minister, Dorset, Coal Merchant. Nov 7 at 11 at offices of Moore and Bowers, Wimborne Minister

Richards, James, Clifton, Bristol, Beer Retailer. Nov 7 at 12 at offices of Clark, High st, Bristol. Stevens, Bristol

Ricketts, John, Dudley, Worcester, Baker. Nov 13 at 3 at offices of Warminster, Castle st, Dudley

Romano, Joseph, Brooklyn rd, Shepherd's Bush, Professor of Music. Nov 12 at 2 at offices of Gamble and Harvey, Gresham buildings, Basinghall st, Urry, Ventnor

Schmidt, Christian, and Henry Stursenacker, Liverpool, Pipe Manufacturers. Nov 17 at 3 at offices of Quinn and Sons, Lord st, Liverpool

Scott, Annie Mary, Coxhoe, Durham, Milliner. Nov 13 at 2 at offices Joel, Newgate st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Smartwaite, John, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Grocer. Nov 13 at 12 at offices of Keenlyside and Forster, Grainger st West, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Squire, Eli, Wetherhampton, Stafford, Grocer. Nov 11 at 4 at offices of Dailow, Queen square, Wolverhampton

Starbrooke, Thomas, Farnham, Hants, Brickmaker. Nov 13 at 11 at offices of Goble, Farnham

Starkey, Thomas, Latchford, Chester, Shoemaker. Nov 10 at 10.30 at offices of Dresherton, Bank st, Warrington

Stennett, Francis, Sewell, Swineshead, Lincoln, Farmer. Nov 12 at 11 at offices of Dyer, Church lane, Boston

Stokos, James, Houghton-le-spring, Durham, Grocer. Nov 14 at 3 at offices of Bell, Lambton st, Sunderland

Sutcliffe, Thomas Benton, Chorlton cum Hardy, Manchester, out of business. Nov 11 at 3 at offices of Sale and Co, Booth st, Manchester

Tannan, George, James place, Bell st, Edgware rd, out of business. Nov 12 at 3 at offices of Ricketts, Frederick st, Gray's Inn rd

Tremble, George, Aspatira, Cumberland, Joiner. Nov 12 at 3 at offices of Wannop, Carruther's court, Scotch st, Carlisle

Watkins, Thomas, Priors Lee, Shifnal, Salop, Licensed Victualler. Nov 16 at 12 at offices of Phillips, Market place, Shifnal

White, George, and David Hart, George st, Tower hill, Wine Merchants. Nov 13 at 12 at the City Terminus Hotel, Cannon st. Lialkaters and Co, Walbrook

Williams, Edward, St George's, Shifnal, Salop, Chemist. Nov 17 at 10 at offices of Taylor, King st, Wellington

Wright, William, Hackney rd, Pastrycook. Nov 11 at 10 at offices of Mackay, Coleman st, Goatly

**FUNERAL REFORM.**—The exorbitant items of the Undertaker's bill have long operated as an oppressive tax upon all classes of the community. With a view of applying a remedy to this serious evil the LONDON NEGROPOLIS COMPANY, when opening their extensive cemetery at Woking, held themselves prepared to undertake the whole duties relating to interments at fixed and moderate scales of charge, from which survivors may choose according to their means and the requirements of the case. The Company also undertakes the conduct of Funerals to other cemeteries, and to all parts of the United Kingdom. A pamphlet containing full particulars may be obtained, or will be forwarded, upon application to the Chief Office, 3 Lancaster-place, Strand, W.C.

## The Companies Acts, 1862 & 1867.

Every requisite under the above Acts supplied on the shortest notice

The BOOKS and FORMS kept in stock for immediate use. MEMORANDA and ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION speedily printed in the proper form for registration and distribution. SHARE CERTIFICATES, DEBENTURES, &c., engraved and printed. OFFICIAL SEALS designed and executed. No charge for sketches. Companies Fee Stamps. Railway Registration Forms.

### Solicitors' Account Books.

## RICHARD FLINT & CO.

(Late ASH & FLINT).

Stationers, Printers, Engravers, Registration Agents, &c., 49, Fleet-street, London, E.C. (corner of Serjeants'-inn). Annual and other Returns Stamped and Filed.

**SAUNDERS'S MUNICIPAL REGISTRATION AND ELECTIONS. THE LAW AND PRACTICE OF MUNICIPAL REGISTRATION AND ELECTIONS,** including the Practice upon Municipal Election Petitions. By THOMAS W. SAUNDERS, Esq., Recorder of Bath. Second Edition. Price 6s. London: LAW TIMES Office, 10, Wellington-street, Strand.

Demy 8vo., price 5s., cloth boards.

**SOLICITORS' BOOK-KEEPING.** An adaptation of DOUBLE ENTRY to the Accounts of Solicitors. By ROBERT HENRY RICHARDSON, M.S.A. Eng., Law Accountant and Auditor. The above will be ready for the second issue in November and sent post-free on receipt of order for (crossed London and County Bank) payable to R. H. RICHARDSON, Ravenscourt-park, Hammermith, London.

## SOLICITORS' DIARY and ALMANAC for 1875.

Now Ready.—No. 1. One page for each day, half-bound, law calf. Price 5s.—No. 2. Two days on each page, half-bound, law calf. Price 4s.—No. 3. Three days on each page, in embossed cloth. Price 2s. 6d. The Appendix contains—CALENDAR of the YEAR—LEGAL DIRECTORY.—LIST of SOLICITORS and BARRISTERS in PRACTICE, &c.—PRACTICE CASES UNDER THE COMMON LAW PROCEDURE ACTS.—NEW STAMP DUTIES.—ACTS of PARLIAMENT of the LAST SESSION, INDEX and DIGEST.—INSURANCE DIRECTORY.—BANKING DIRECTORY. WATERLOW & SONS, LONDON.

### THE LONDON GAZETTE.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY HARRISON & SONS,

45 and 46, St. Martin's-lane, Charing-cross, W.C.

## HARRISON & SONS, Printers and Publishers of

The London Gazette, undertake the insertion of Parliamentary Notices, and Legal and General Advertisements in the London Gazette, and all Metropolitan, Provincial, and Foreign Journals. Files of the London, Dublin, and Edinburgh Gazettes are kept for inspection; and Gazette Stamps can be procured, and all necessary information obtained, at 45, St. Martin's-lane.

LONDON GAZETTE (published by authority) and LONDON and COUNTRY ADVERTISEMENT OFFICE. No. 117, CHANCERY LANE, FLEET STREET.

**HENRY GREEN, Advertisement Agent,** begs to direct the attention of the Legal Profession to the advantages of his long experience of upwards of twenty-five years, in the special insertion of all pro forma notices, &c., and hereby solicits their continued support.—N.B. One copy of advertisement only required, and the strictest care and promptitude assured. Officially stamped forms for advertisement and file of "London Gazette" kept, by appointment.